

THE
PROTESTANTS
PLAIN CONFESSIO^N,
CONFESSIO^N,

THAT THE ROMAN CHVRCH
is the true Church of God, that in her is
saui^{ng} faith, saluation, and safetie: and
that the chefest point of Protestancie, is
the Doctrin of the Diuel.

By R. C. Doctor of Diuinitie.

Deuteronom. 32.

*Our God is not as their Gods, and our enemies
are indges.*

1. Thimot. 4.

*In the latter dayes, some shal departe from faith,
harbering to spirits of error, and Doctrins
of Diuells.*

1645.



TO THE GENTLE Reader.



ENTLE Reader, maruell not, if thou here readest learned Protestants, now confessing the Roman Church to be a true Church, naie the Church, to be a Spouse of Christ, to hold al points fundamental, or necessarie to saluation, to haue a sauing faith, to haue saluation, naie safetie, and securitie of saluation, and now denying al thes. For as they are impugned by contrarie aduersaries, so they deliuer contrarie doctrin concerning the Roman Church, and (as some of them profess) do accomodate their doctrin to times, and persons. For whiles they are vrged ether by Anabaptists, that Baptisme giuen in the Roman Church is not good; or by Puritans, that the vocation, or mission of their Bishops, or Ministers, or their Cere-

*Zuingl. lib.
de Relig. cap.
de Euchar.
Melancthon
in Hospin.
par. 2. fol.
90.*

4 *To the Gentle Reader.*

monies not lawful , becaus they had them from the Roman Church, or by Trinitaries , that there is noe Trinitie, becaus it is the foundation of the Roman Church , or by Atheists , that Christs Church hath heretofore perished , becaus there can be no Christian Church proued to haue continued since Christ , but the Roman Church, or els are conuined by the euidentie of the truth , they confess , that the Roman Church is a true Church, hath true Bapisme , hath lawful Mission, hath the keyes of heauen , hath sauing faith , and saluation , and hath continued euer since Christ. But when on the contrarie, they are vrged by Catholiks , that if the Roman Church be a true Church , and Spouse of Christ, then the Protestants Church , can bee no true Church becaus it differeth from the Roman Church in manie substantial points of faith , as in Sacrifice , Sacraments , part of Gods Word, in the verie meanes of obteining remission of sins , in communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God,

To the Gentle Reader.

all which are essential parts of the Church, and what Churches differ in essential parts, differ essentially: And if the Roman Church haue al that is needful to saluation, or hold not, or do not anie thing, which is destructive of saluation, there was no need to leaue the Roman Church, or anie excuse to abide out of her (for what seek we in a Church but saluation) then they change their tune, and saie, the Roman Church is no true Church, holdeth not al points fundamental, or necessarie to saluation, hath not al things necessarie to saluation, hath some things, that deserue damnation, is the whore of Babilon, an Anti-Christian Synagog, and what not? so that, as it serueth their turne to defend them selues from cōtrarie Aduersaries, the Roman Church hath, by their doctrin, contrarie natures. But howsoeuer they change their doctrin of the Roman Church, and affirme or denie, as it serueth their turne, that shee is, or is not a true Church, hath or hath not al necessarie to saluation,

hath or hath not anie thing deseruing damnation, she beeing once granted to be a true Church, and Spouse of Christ, it must needs follow, that what Church soeuer is opposit to her, as the Protestants is, in maine points of faith, in the verie meanes of remission of sins, in communion of Sacraments, and publik seruice of God, and in the Ministers therof, is no true Church, no Spouse of Christ, hath no true meanes of saluatiō, becaus Christ hath not two opposit churhes, two opposit spouses, two opposit waies of saluation.

Nether let the Reader think, that becaus thos Protestants, who grant the Roman Church to be a true Church, and Spouse of Christ, to hold al things necessarie to saluation, and nothing destructive of saluation; do at some times denie this, therefore their testimonie is not to be regarded, as of men, who contradict them selues; becaus as it auaieth not a guiltie man, if hee haue confessed a thing against himself, to denie it afterward; so it will

not auaille protestants , that they do
 some times denie , what they haue
 against them selues confessed of the
 Roman Church, which they impugne.
 Besids when they denie the Roman
 Church to be a true Church , they do
 not profess, that they recal their for-
 mer confessions of her truth, and con-
 sequently their confessions of her
 truth stand in force , as well , as their
 denials of the same. Be a Liars testi-
 monie of no value ether against an
 other , or for himself ; yet a Liars con-
 fession against himself is of great force
 against himself : And I produce here
 the words , of protestants for the truth
 of the Roman Church , not as testi-
 monies of witnesses worthy of credit,
 but as confessions of Aduersaries
 against themselues : For, as the Orator *Cicero pro*
 said most truly : *Thy testimonie which Quint.*
in an other cause were naught worth , in
thine owne , becaus it is against thy self,
ought to be most weightie.

INDEX OF THE

Chapters of this booke.

Chapter I.

T*hat the Adversaries confession of a truth, is a convincent argument against them selues.*

Chap. II.

That Adversaries confession ought to be a forcible argument against their fellowes.

Chap. III.

That the most and learnedest Protestants confes the Rom. Church to be a true Church, and the true Church.

Chap. IIII.

That Protestants confes the Church of God to be but one.

Chap. V.

That Protestants confes, the Roman and Protestant Church to be substantially different.

Chap. VI.

That Protestants confes, that the Roman Church hath saving faith.

INDEX.

Chap. VII.

That Protestants confes, that saving faith is substantially but one.

Chap. VIII.

That Protestants confes, that the faith of the Roman and Protestant Church, is substantially different.

Chap. IX.

That Protestants confes, that salvation may be had in the Roman Church and Religion.

Chap. X.

That Protestants confes, that there is safetie, or securitie of salvation, in the Roman Church.

Chap. XI.

That of different waies of salvation that is the safer, which the Adversaries confes to be good.

Chap. XII.

That the safer waie to salvation, is to be chosen before the unsafer.

Chap. XIII.

Some Protestants answer to the Catholiks argument, taken from their forsaide confessions, refuted.

INDEX.

Chap. XIV.

That Luther and diuers Protestants confesse, that he learnt the cheifest point of Protestancie, of the Diuel.

Chap. XV.

That Protestants confesse, that Masse was highly esteemed of al Christians before Luther impugned it.

Chap. XVI.

That Luthers doctrine, that Masse is naught, is the doctrine of the Diuel.

Chap. XVII.

Protestants euasions, that their doctrine against Masse, is not the Diuels doctrine, refuted.





THAT THE ADVERSARIES confession of a truth, is a
convincent argument against
them selues.

CHAPTER I.

I. **T**HAT the Adversaries
Confession of a truth, is
a cōvincent Argument
against them selues, is
eident. First, becaus
Moises vsed it Deuter. 32. v. 31. *For
our God is not as their Gods, and our Ene-
mies are Iudges.* Wher vpon Morton *Moises ar-
gued out of
Adversaries
confession.*
in his Imposture c. 15. said: *The Certi-
ficate of enemies, is the most exact ap-
probation of a others, as Moises shewed.*
Our Sauour also found it to be more
effectual with the Iewes, then ether *And Christ!*
plaine Testimonies of Scripture, or
Miracles. For when he could not stop

12 C. 1. *An Adversaries Confession*

their mouthes with ether Scripture or Miracles, he so conuincd them out of their owne words, *as they answered him no word: nether durst anie one from that daie* (as the Euangelist saith) *ask him anie word more.* And S. Augustin Collat. 3. diei c. 16. saith: *That Christ conuincing the Iewes by their owne facts, did bring them to truth.* And l. 1. c. 17. contra Crescon: *That Christ did often argue against the Iewes, out of their owne words.* And the Catholiks found the like in the Donatists. For when they answered to al other arguments brought by Catholiks out of Scripture, they were so confounded with their fact towards the Maximinists, that (as S. Augustin saith) *They were alwaies altogether dumb at that.* And Collat. 3. diei c. 8. 11. *therefore this kinde of arguing against Heretiks out of their owne words or deeds, the holie Fathers both much commended, and vsed them selues.*

And the Fathers.

2. Dionisius Alexandrin in Euseb. l. 7. c. 6. *This doth much help me, that I can reprove them out of their own words.* S. Ireneus l. 2. c. 53. *often times*

Convincent against himself. C. 1. 13
we reprove them by their own words. And
(as Euseb. writeth l. 5. c. 8.) he promi-
sed to write a book, wher in he would con-
fute Martion, out of Martions writings.
Tertullian, or Novatian li. de Trini-
tate c. 13. It is a strong kinde of proof,
which is taken from Adversaries, that
truth maie be proved even by the enemies
of truth. S. Gregorie Nazianzen orat.
de S. Basilio: It is the greatest prudence
and force of speech, to binde the adver-
sarie with his owne words. S. Augustin
l. contrâ Secundinum c. 3. Nether wil
I bring forth other decrees, by which Ma-
nichees error appeareth, then out of thy
epistle: And nevertheles he preferreth
that book, before al others which he
wrote against the Manichees.

Retract. l. 2.
c. 20.

3. Naie, they saie, that this kinde
of arguing against heretiks, is both
necessarie, and more effectual with
them, then anie other. S. Ireneus l. 1.
c. 35. *It was necessarie to disprove the Va-*
lentinians, from such mothers, Fathers,
and grand-fathers of theirs. And l. 4. c.
14. That is a true proof, and not to be
gainesaid, which bringeth signe of testi-

14 C.i. *An Adversaries Confession*
monie, from the Adversaries themselves.
 Tertullian l. de Anima, c.3. *The Testi-*
monie from Adversaries, is oftentimes
necessarie. S. Athanasius l. de Carne
 Christi. *We must oppose to contentious*
men, their own Arguments, in which is
my greatest hope of overcoming. S. Chry-
 sostom Homil. 3. in Epist. ad Titum:
With thes we must overcome them, when
we retort their accusers, who were greatly
esteemed by them. S. Augustin, when
 he saw, that the Donatists were most
 cōfounded by their owne fact towards
 some Maximinists, in whom they ap-
 proved that, which they cōdemned in
 Catholiks, oftentimes exhorteth Ca-
 tholiks, that omitting al other Argu-
 ments, they should presse them with
 this. *Hold (saith he) this one fact of the*
Maximinists, fasten this in their fore-
heads, answer to al by the Maximinists,
only. And againe: *I wil not goe from this*
one fact, which God hath cast upon their
faces, for to shut their mouthes, and to
amend them, if they be wise, or to confound
them, if they remaine in their perversitie.
 And in likesort, when he saw the Do-

L. i. contra
 Pesil. c. 1. 14.
 27. epist. 50.

Convincent against him self. C.1. is
natists cause quite overthrown; by that
saying of theirs : *Nether cause doth
preiudice cause, nor person, person*: he thus
speaketh to Catholiks Serm. 22. de
verbis Apostolic. 9. *I praie you, I be-
seech you for Christ, that you hold, saie,
and have it alwaies in your mouth: For
there could be noe sentence given for us,
breifer, sūrer, or plainer.*

4. And Protestants grant the same. *Protestants*
For thus Luther l. de Ser. Arbit. tom. *confes the*
2. fol. 442. *There is no proof stronger, same.*
*then the guiltie mans own Confession, and
his testimonie against him self.* And tom.
5. in c. primum. 1. Petri fol. 449. *None
can convince a Liar better, then out of his
own words.* Hessusius l. contrâ Calvin
& Bezam : *The speediest waie of al to
convince an Adversarie, is that, which
is grounded on his own confession: wherein
he openly acknowledgeth that, which is
objected.* Osiander in epistola Eucharis.
*The Cōfession and testimonie of an cnemie,
hath greateſt authoritie.* Petrus Martyr
in Locis tit. de Iudæis colum. 390.
*Surely, among other testimonies, that is
the weightiest, which Adversaries give.*

16 C. 1. *An Adversaries Confession*
L. Laude in his Relation of the Con-
ference, &c. sec. 35. p. 284. *All Argu-
ments are verie moving, that laie their
ground upon the Adversaries Confession,
especially if it be confessed and avouched to
be true. Bancroft in his Survey c. 8.
Let vs hold that; which they have grated:
you maie build securely upon that, as truth,
scing they are forced to cōfes it. Whitaker
in his Preface to his Controversies.
It is notable and magnifical for triumph,
to be approved by testimonie of Adver-
saries. And Controv. 2. q. 5. c. 14. It
must needs be a strong argument, which
is drawn from the Confession of Adver-
saries. For the testimonie of Adversaries
wil be effectual against themselves. Mor-
ton in the epistle dedicatorie of his
Appeale: Which kinde of assistance of
learned Adversaries, them selves have
laied down for the greatest reason of satis-
faction, and we do accordingly admit it.
For if it be held an excellent point of
Phisick, ex vipera Theriacum, to turne
poison into an antidote against poison: and
in God a high degree of vengeance, to
turne the Egyptians against the Egyptians:
and in*

*Greatest sa-
tisfaction.*

Esaiā 19.

Convincent against himself. C.1. 17
and in David, celebrated as a principal
matter of triumph, to cutt of Goliath his
head with his own sword: And in Christ, Luca 19.
observed as an unanswerable manner of
conviction, to iudge the evil servant out
of his own mouth: And acknowledged in Tit. 1.
S. Paul, as the most expedite meanes of
confutation of the men of Crcte, to oppose
against them their owne Poet, whom he
calleth their Prophet: Then maie we iustly
presume better of our cause, wherin our
Adversaries wil prove our rightful Ad-
vocates. Thus he, not only affirmeth,
but also proveth out of Scripture, that
the Adversaries confession, is a most
convincent Argument against himself.
And reason sheweth the same. For it
must needs be an evident truth, which
the Adversarie therof confesseth. At
least, his confession therof, must needs
be most forcible against himself, as we
see in al Tribunals, where no other
proof is required against the accused,
when he pleadeth Guiltie. And expe-
rience sheweth, that no proofs more
gag the mouthes of Protestants, then
such, as are taken out of the Cōfessions
of Protestants.

18 C. 1. *An Adversaries Confession*

5. And in particuler, touching the Adversaries confession, that that Church, which they impugne, is true, thus writeth S. Augustin to the Donatists lib. post collation: *When they confirme that Church, with which, it is manifest, we communicate, and they do not, they confes they are overcome, and shew most plainely to you, if you be wise, what you should leave, and what you should follow.* Which he repeateth againe epist. 152. And the same confes divers of the Learned Protestants; Calvin Institit. l. 4, c. 2. §. 10. *We cannot grant them (Papists) a Church, but we must needs be subiect, and obey.* Item: *If they be Churches, the keyes are with them, and the keyes have an inseparable tie with the word. If they be Churches, Christs promise is of force with them; whomsoever you shal binde, &c.* Cameron lib. de Ecclesia c. 21. *If we did accord, that the Roman Church were the true Church, without doubt we should avow, that she never erred in the foundation. Let them therefore prove that she is, and we wil pas over the rest, and we wil freely confes,*

Nota.

*why some
Prols denie
the Rom.
Church.*

Convincent against him self. C.I. 19
 that we have been scismatiks in separating
 ourselues from her communion. And
 againe: Truly if we accord, that Poperie
 is the spouse of Iesus Christ, and that her
 Doctors, are the successors of the Apostles,
 they wil have gainned their cause. Val-
 lada in his Apologie against the
 Bishop of Luzon c. 20. 1. If it were out
 of controversie, that the Church of Rome,
 as it is this daie, were the true Church, we
 would al run to her, knowing, that out of
 the Church there is no salvation. Feild 1.
 3. de Eccles. c. 47. Surely if he can prove,
 that we confes, that she (Roman) is the
 Church, he need no other Argument. And
 generally Protestants agree, that we
 maie not separate ourselues from
 anie Companie. which is substantially
 a true Church Calvin Instit. l. 4. c. 1.
 §. 10. So much God esteemeth the Com-
 munion of his Church, that he accounteth
 him a Renegate, and forsaker of religion,
 whosoever stubbornly separateth himself
 from anie Christian societie, which hath
 the true Ministerie of the word and Sa-
 craments. Caufabon Exercit. 15. con-
 trâ Baron. It is vndoubted truth, where

See Philpot
in For. p.

1640. l.
laude Relat.
sec. 35 p. 313.

Note. and
see him con-
fessing this
c. 13. n. 3.

20 C. 1. *An Adversaries Confession*
pious people adhere to a lawful and true
Bishop, there is a Church of God, so that,
who separateth himself from that compa-
nie, it cannot be doubted, but he is out of
the Church. Zanchius de Ecclesia c. 7.
From a Church of Christ, as long as it is a
Church of Christ, we must not depart.
Perkins in his Reformed Catholik
Traet. 21. We may not wholly forsake anie
people till they forsake Christ. And in
his Explication of the Creed. As long
as anie Church doth not goe from Christ,
we must not separate ourselues from her.
And we shal shew, that Protestants
confes the Roman Church to be a
true Church, to be the Church, a
Spouse of Christ, that she is not di-
vorced from Christ, that she hath the
true Ministerie of the word and Sa-
craments, nay al Christian good.
Thus have we proved by Scripture,
Fathers, Reason, and Protestants,
that the confession of truth by the
Adversarie of that truth, is a most
convincent argument against the Ad-
versarie therof: and in particular,
that the confession of the truth of a

Convincent against himself. C.I. 21

Church by the Adversaries of that Church, is a convincent argument against them, that they should not forsake her. And if the confession of the Adversaries be in all kinds of truth a convincent argument against themselves, much more, when it is such a truth, as thereof evidently followeth the condemnation of such a point, as they most highly esteem: as out of the truth of the Roman Church and Religion, evidently followeth (as we shall see hereafter) the condemnation of the Protestants Church and Religion. And thus having proved, that the confession of a truth by the Adversaries thereof, is a convincent argument of that truth against themselves: Now let vs shew, that it is a forcible argument also against their brethren, for to confesse the same Truth.

Note this.

THAT THE ABSOLUTE
*Confession of a main point by
 manie ad Learned Adversaries,
 ought to be a forcible argument to
 the rest of their fellowves.*

CHAPTER II.

I. **T**HAT the absolute Confession
 of a main point, by manie
 and the Learnedest Adversaries,
 ought to be a forcible argument to
 the rest of their Brethren, for to con-
 fesse the same, is evident. And absolute
 Confession I cal that (as I shal declare
 n. 3.) which one maketh indepen-
 dently of anie, or without submission
 to anie other. First, becaus reason
 iudgeth that truth to be evidēt, which
 manie and the Learnedest Adversa-
 ries therof cōfesse to be truth. For being
 manie, and the Learnedest, they were
 like to espie falshood, if anie were.
 And it being a main point, and they

Forcible against their fellowes. C. 2. 23

Adversaries therof, are not like to confes, but what they could not denie.

If therefore authoritie can prevaile with their fellowes, (as in reason it should) the authoritie of manie, and the learnedest of their owne Companions, should prevaile with them : becaus except divine authoritie, it is the most moving authoritie to them, that can be.

*Confession
of Adversaries,
most moving
authoritie.*

2. Secondly, becaus thos manie and learnedest Adversaries who confes the main truth, have weighed and considered the reasons, which others their fellowes bring against that truth: and notwithstanding al thos reasons to the contrarie, do confes that truth.

And being manie, and learnede then thos who denie that truth, reason bindeth the to incline rather to their side, who confes that truth, then to theirs, who denie it : becaus reason bindeth to incline rather to the greater learning, then to the les : to the greater authoritie, then to the les.

2. Thirdly, becaus but a few learned Donatists in the Conference

*Collat. 3.
diei. c. 16.*

24 C. 2. *Adversaries Confession*
between them and Catholiks, did saie,
that *one cause ought not to preiudice an
other: nor one person, an other:* And yet
both S. Augustin and al Catholiks
took main advantage therof against
al Donatists, becaus that did quite
overthrow their cause, and shewed,
that their pretended faults against
Cecilian, could be no iust cause of
their scisme from other Catholiks.

3. Fourthly, becaus the holie Fa-
thers did thus argue against heretiks.
S. Ireneus l. 1. c. 35. *It is needful to re-
prove the Valentinians by their Mothers,
Fathers, and great Grandfathers.* And
S. Chrystom Homil. 3. in epist ad
Titum: *Thos we then especially con-vince,
when we make them their accusers, who
were admired of them.* Fiftly, becaus
Protestants vse this kinde of arguing
against Catholiks, whensoever they
can bring the testimonies of anie Ca-
tholiks against vs, how few or how
vnlearned soever they be, and in
what kinde of matter soever. How
much more ought they to allow our
kinde of arguing against them, out of

Morton
white.

Forcible against their fellowes. C. 2. 25
the Confession of manie of them, of
the learnedest of them, and in so
main a point, as thes are, to wit,
Whether the Roman Church be a
true Church, teach saving faith, and
the true waie to salvation, or no? And
as for Catholiks, if they be true Ca-
tholiks, they teach no matter of faith
absolutly, vnles they be sure the Ca-
tholik Church teacheth it, but con-
ditionally only, to wit, so it be not
against the doctrin of the Catholik
Church, as is evident in al Catholiks,
who submit al their writings to the
iudgment of the Catholik Church,
and is confessed by Peter Martyr ora.
de morte Christi to. 2. locorū cōmun.
101. Whitaker Controv. 2. q. 5. c. 8.
Morton Apolog. l. 2. c. 31. And Chil-
lingw. c. 5. p. 280. saith: *Abide in your
Churches Communion I cannot, without
professing to beleve your entire doctrim
true.* wherfore in vaine is anie Catho-
liks saying brought against the doc-
trin of the Catholik Church. For if it
be indeed contrarie, it is virtually re-
voked by him self: And so his reso-

lute virtual revoking of it, maketh more for the doctrine of the Church, then his conditional assertion of it, maketh against her doctrine. But what Protestants teach, they teach not conditionally, if it be according to the doctrine of their Church: (For they account her as Fallible as themselves) but deliver it absolutely and independently of any, and without submission to any. And therefore, being many, and the most learned among them, their absolute Confession of a main point of controversy, ought much to move the rest of their Brethren. For what better Judges for them can they chuse, then their own Brethren, and the many, and of the greatest learning among them? Wherefore either in the main points of controversy, they must refuse all men Judges, which is a signe of a most desperate cause, and of a wrangling minde, which will not make a reasonable end of controversies: or they must admit for sufficient Judges of the truths, their own, many, and

Forcible against their fellowes. C. 2. 27
most learned fellowes.

4. Wherefore thus I ask of such Protestants, as wil not confes, or do denie the truth of the Roman Church, and saving faith or salvation in her; which manie and the most learned of their Brethren do confes: wil they admit thes manie, and most learned of their Brethren for Iudges in thes main points of controversie, or no? If they wil admit them for sufficient Iudges, we have won the cause. For they plainly give Iudgment for vs. If they wil not admit them, whom can they name more sufficient, or more favorable to them, then thes are? If they wil admit no men Iudges of thes main points, let them plainly saie so, and let the Reader iudg of their cause, which them selues account so il, as they wil not suffer anie to be Iudges of it, no not their own, manie, and learnedest freinds. For what greater real confession can there be of an il cause, then that the maintainers therof, wil not admit so much as greatest and learnedest freinds to the cause, to be

Judges of it? If anie saie, that Scripture alone ought to be Iudge of al Controversies: I replie, that Chillingworth. c. 2. p. 57. saith: (And three cheif Doctors of Oxford testifie, that he saith nothing different from the doctrin of the English Protestant Church) that *to speak properly, the Scripture is not a Iudge of Controversies, but a Rule only.* And it is evident, becaus a proper Iudge must heare the parties, which the Scripture cannot. Wherfore to admit only the Scripture, is to refuse anie true Iudge. Besids, whom can they think better vnderstandeth the Scripture in thes main points, then their own, manie, and most learned Brethren? At least, why shal anie indifferent man think, that they better vnderstand the Scripture in thes main points, then their own, manie, and learned brethren? Wherfore I propose to indifferent Protestants, the like choice, as Scaurus did to the Romans, whether they should beleve him, or his meane adversarie: The most, and the learnedest Protestant

Forcible against their fellowes. C. 2. 29

writers, grant the Roman Church to be a true Church, to teach saving faith, and the true waie of salvation: The fewer, and les learned Protestant writers denie it: whom wil you (indifferent Protestants) beleve? wil you not beleve the more, rather then the fewer: the more learned, rather then the les learned: or wil you saie, you wil beleve the fewer, and the les learned with Scripture, rather then the more and learned without or against Scripture? But both of them alleadg Scripture, for what they saie: and wil you think, that the fewer and les learned have Scripture for them, rather then the more and more learned? Whence can you think, that the fewer and the les learned should finde out the true meaning of the Scripture in thes main points, rather then the more, and the more learned, unles you wil put Enthusiasmes with the Aanabaptists, or voluntarily feigne, that thos were more assisted by the holie Ghost, then thes? And yet, why should you think, that thos had such

Enthusiasmes , or special assistance of the holie Ghost , rather then thes ? Is the Scripture , in thes main points , cleare ? How then could not the more , and more learned Protestants finde the true sense of it , as wel as the fewer and les learned ? Is it obscure ? How then should the fewer , and les learned Protestants finde it out , rather then the more , and more learned ? Both of them being equally vrged by Catholiks about thes main points , both of them equally studying and laboring to answer Catholiks about thes points , with least disadvantage to Protestacie ; and (as I suppose) equally assisted of the spirit : That some fewer , and les learned , being more vrged , and more studying some point , or more assisted by the Holie Ghost , should finde out the truth of Scripture , in some obscure point , rather then the more and more learned , les vrged , or les studying the Scripture , or les assisted by the holie Ghost , were no marvel : But that being no more vrged , nor more studying the Scripture , nor more assisted by the

Holie Ghost, should finde the true sense of Scripture, in so main points of Christian Religion, as the foresaid points are, is no waie likelie, nor reasonable, but mere voluntarily affirmed. And in effect it is to saie: *stat pro ratione voluntas*: and to leave reason, and to follow blinde wil in the main choice of religion and salvation of soules. With which kinde of men, there is no reasoning or disputing with reason, but only praying for them. And thus having shewed, that the Adversaries Confession of a truth, is convincent against them selues: and also, that the Confession of most, and most learned Adversaries, ought to be a forcible argument to their brethren, for to confesse the same truth, especially in so main points of Controversie, as is the truth of the Roman Church, and saving faith and salvation in her: Let vs now shew, that the most and most learned Protestant writers confesse, that the Roman Church is a true Church, and that there is saving faith and salvation in her: out of which we shal

32 C. 2. *Adversaries Confession*
clearly infer, that she alone is the true
Church, and in her alone, is saying
faith and salvation.

THAT THE MOST,
and learnedest Protestants confes
the Roman Church to be a true
Church, and the true Church.

CHAPTER III.

I. **T**HAT the most, and learnedest
Protestants confes the Roman
Church to be a true Church in substan-
ce, a Catholik Church, a part of the Bodie
of Christ, to be the Church, the Temple,
and very Sanctuarie of God, is evident.
For thus Luther in his epistle contra
Anabaptistas tom. 2. German fol. 267.
cited by Vlemberg causa. 17. and
acknowledged by divers Protestants:
Whitaker Field Hall. infra, Chilling.
c. 6. p. 381. L. Laude p. 281. I saie vnder,
*Poperie is true Christianitie: yea the true
kernel of*

*The kernel
of Christiani-
tie.*

to be a true Church. C. 3. 33

kernel of Christianitie. Againe: If Christianitie be vnder poperie, it wil follow, that it is a Bodie, and member of Christ: If it be his Bodie, it hath the true spirit, Gospel, faith, baptisme, Sacrament of the Altar, Keyes, office of preaching, prayer, holie scripture, finally al things, which Christianitie ought to have. And the same Luther to. 2. contra Bullam fol. 92. It is glorie enough for the Church of Rome, to be a smal parte of the Vniuersal Church. Tom. 6. in C. 36. Genes. fol. 396. We confes, that among Papists is a Church, becaus they have Baptisme, absolution, the Text of the Gospel, and there are manie holie men among them.

And in c. 41. fol. 549. Vnder Poperie, Manie ^{sa-} we had the word, and doubtles manie ^{ued in faith} were saved in the faith therof. Calvin in ^{of Poperie.}

2. Thessal. 2. v. 4. I confes, it is the Temple of God, in which the Pope ruleth. ^{The Temple of God.}

In Gratulatione ad Præcentorem p. 372. Paul affirmeth, that Anti-Christ shal sit in the verie Sanctuarie of God. ^{The Sanctuarie of God.}

Respons. ad Sadolet p. 128. We denie not, that they are Churches of Christ, which you govern. 4. Instit. c. 2. §. 12.

34 C. 3. Prot. confes the Ro. Church.

We denie not, that there are Churches among them. And 9. 11. Gods couenant remained among them. And Epist. 194. ad Zozinum. I think, I have proved with reasons strong enough, that in Poperie remaineth a Church, though half fallen down, yea (if you wil) broken and deformed, yet a Church. In Ezechiel. 16.

Proved
strongly.

A Church
in Poperie..

The Temple
of God.

Christs
Church in
the bowels
of Poperie.

In the midst
of Poperie.

v. 20. Yea there (in Poperie) is a Church. For els Pauls prophetie were false, where he saith, that Anti-Christ shal sit in the Temple of God. Beza 1. question. Vol. 3. p. 346. Christianitie remained heretofore, and yet remaineth, as buried in Poperie I said, that Christ would, and yet wil, that his Church lie hid in the Bowels of Poperie. I saie, that the people, which in general are comprehended vnder thos twoe factions, Papisme Grecisme, and which manifestly tend to that cutting of, which Paul foretold, are not yet to be iudged cut of, as long as the external note of Baptisme there remaineth, and that yet is gathered a Church out of the midst, and in the midst of Poperie. And p. 347. Christianitie is yet in Poperie. And in 2. Thessal. 2. v. 5. By the Temple of God,

to be a true Church. C. 3. 35

he vnderstandeth, the verie Church of God, in which (saith he) even that lost man sitteth. Plessie of the Church c. 2.

The life of this (Roman) Church hangeth but by a verie smal thred. ----- So long as

The Ro.
Church
hath life.

that smal thred remaineth, we denie her not the name of a Church, no more then to a man, so long as he is alive, though he be never so sick, we denie the name of a man:

A Spouse.

yea we are content to cal her Spouse, in as much, as she makes a parte of the visible

Church. C. 10. P. 354. We saie, that the Church of Rome doth stil bring forth children to God by Baptisme. P. 358. For

in this, that we hold, that Anti-Christ ruleth there, we hold consequently, that it is the Church, becaus he could not sit

Is this
Church.

anie where, but in the Church. Iunius l. de Eccles. c. 17. saith, that the Popish

Church, as it hath that, which belongeth to the Church, is a Church, nor hath lost life: And addeth, By the calling of God,

Hath not
lost life.

we iudge her yet to be a Church. Zanchius Præfat. libr. de natura Dei: Satan could

not, even in the Roman Church, bring al to that pas, that it had no forme of a Church. And soone after: wherfore the

36 C. 3. Prot. confes the Ro. Church.

Roman Church, is yet a Church of Christ.

None in his
wits can
denie.

And l. 2. Epistolarum p. 143. No man in
his wits can denie, ether thos (Protestants)
or thes (Papists) to be Churches of Christ,
who knoweth what is a Church, and which
are the true Notes of the Church. Alsted
l. de Eccles. c. 2. The Roman Church is

Truly a true
Church.

Not divor-
ced nor de-
prived of
life.

at this daie truly a true Church. And c. 21.

The Popish Church is a Church of Christ,
but corrupted and deformed. For as yet

she hath not openly divorced herself from
Christ, nor altogether lost spiritual life.

Bucanus loco 41. de Eccles. q. 5. The
Assemblies of Papists are Churches, as a
man infected with Leprosie, or bereaft of
his wits, is stil a man. Polanus parte 1.

Thesi de Eccles. The Roman, is truly a
Church, becaus Anti-Christ sitteth in the
Church. And in Syntagme. Theol. l. 7.

c. 8. The present Roman Church is yet a
Church of Christ. Boyseul in Refutat of
Sponde p. 6. I exclud not the Roman
Church out of the universal Church. I

In the co-
venant of
God.

acknowledg her to be yet in the covenant of
God. which he repeateth p. 32. and 283.

And. p. 12. The Roman Church, is a
Church of God. p. 19. Is a member of the

to be a true Church. C. 3. 37

universal Church. and p. 822. We denie
not, that the Roman Church is a Church
of Iesus-Christ, redeemed by him. Vor-
tius in his Antibellarm. p. 188. The Po-
pular Roman Church hath not yet quite
lost spiritual life, hath not yet made di-
vorce from Christ. And Peter Martyr
epist. ad Bullinger to. 2. loc. colum.
270. writeth, that he perswaded the
Catholiks and Sacramentaries, to ac-
count one the other, brethren, not to
call one the other, heretiks. Spalaten-
sis l. contra Suarem c. 1. n. 20. I think
(as I have often said) the Roman Church,
with thos that follow her, to be a true
Church of Christ. Which he hath also n.
5. and 6. Finally Seravia defens. l. de
gradibus Ministrorum, p. 30. The Ro-
man Church is a Church, and see, what I
wil saie more: she is our Mother, in whom,
and by whom, God hath regenerated vs.

Not lost
life.

A true
Church.

And p. 31. The covenant of God at this
daie, remaineth in the Latin Church. Our Mo-
ther Church.
Thus forraine Protestants.

2. Of English Protestants: King
James in his first speech to the Parla-
ment 1603. I acknowledg the Church of

38 C. 3. Prot. confes the Ro. Church.

Roman
Church
Mother
Church.

Member of
the Catho-
lik Church.

Of the fa-
milie of
Christ.

who live,
and die in
her, maie be
saved.

Rome to be our Mother Church, but de-
filed with errors, and corruptions; Nether
am I anemie of the Roman Church. I
would not have the Temple destroyed, but
the filth swept out. And in his Epistle to
Cardinal Peron: The Roman Church,
Greek, &c. are membres of the Catholik
Church. D. Andrewes in his Tortura
Torti, towards the end, thus speaketh,
to Papiſts: we are content to cal you mem-
bers of the Catholik Church, though not
hole members. Hooker l. 3. Ecclesiastical
politie p. 128. we gladly acknowledg them
to be of the Familie of Iesus-Christ. And
l. 5. p. saith of the Roman Church.
She is to be reputed a part of the house of
God. And Covell in his Apologie for
Hooker p. 68. We affirme them (of the
Roman Church) to be parts of the
Church of Christ, and that thos that live,
and die in that Church, maie notwith-
standing be saved. Whitaker Controv.
2. q. 3. c. 2. p. 471. So Christ heretofore
reigned in the midst of Poperie, in which
he had alwaies manie Godly and faithfull
subiects. Controv. 4. q. 5. c. 3. p. 682.
He calleth the Popish Church, the

Temple of God. And there, by the ^{The Temple} Temple of God in which Anti-Christ ^{of God.} shal sit, (which he wil have to be the Roman Church) he ynderstandeth, the verie true Church of God, the societie of the Faithful, the livelie Temple built ^{The Temple} of livelie stones, as are the faithful and ^{of God.} elect. And saith: Among them (Papists) is a certaine ministerie, and some preaching of the word, which (without doubt) ^{without} availeth manie to salvation: And as Gods ^{doubt.} gifts are without repentance, so the Covenant which God hath made with Christian people, he doth not quite dissolve, God had his, in al ages, in the Popish Church. And Controv. 2. q. 5. c. 14. confesseth, that Luther said: In Poperie is al Christian good, the keyes, the office of preaching, true Christianitie, yea the true kernel of Christianitie. And that by Poperie, he meant, the Papistical Church. And addeth: Thes things are with them. ^{Hath the} The Papists have thes things. ^{kernel of} And q. 6. c. 2. In thes latter times, there ^{Christiani-} could no famous Church be named, which ^{tie.} was thought a Church, and to which the name of Church, was given, besids the

40 C. 3. Prot. confes the Ro. Church.

Pious wor-
ship in the
Ro. C.

Roman Church. And lib. 7. contra Du-
reum fec. 9. In the Rom. Church, though
never so lost and overthrown, Christ hath
conserved his Church, in which holie and
pious worship florished. Rainolds in his
fift conclusion: *The Church of Rome is
sick of a canker.* And A sick Church, is
stil a true Church, as a sick man, is a
true man. Hall in his Rome irreconcil.
fec. 1. faith of the Roman Church:
She is truly a visible Church: and that
she differeth from the Protestant, as a
sick Church, from a hole. In his book of
the old Religion in fine: *The Latin or
Western Church, subiect to the Romish
Tirannie, was a true Church, in which a
savig faith of the truth of Christ was
found.* See him c. 1. p. 5. and 7. c. vlt p.
194. 195. And the same have his two
Defenders, Cholmeley and Batter-
feild, of which, the latter, saith: *He
wil demonstrate, that the Roman Church,
is a true Church.* Feately in his Refutat.
of Fisher p. 82. *The Roman Church, we
acknowledg to be a member, though a sick
and weak one, of the Catholik visible
Church.* Morton in his Appeale l. 4. c.
2. sec.

Saving
faith in
Rom. Ch.

A true
Church.

to be a true Church. C. 3. 42

2. sec. 5. And so much les, maie we despair of some of the members, of the Roman Church, by how much more evident it is, by their practise at the hour of their death, even then, when they presume, that they are to performe the ovt of Martyrdom, they removing al confidence of their perfectnes, do cast anker upon the mercie of God in Christ, for the ful remission of sinns. And in his Imposture c. 15. some deying in the Church of Rome, for their belcif in Christ, maie be in state of life. Feild. 1. 3. of the Church. c. 47. saith some of the Roman Church are in that degree of orthodexie, that we maie wel hope of their salvation. White in his waie p. 352. maketh the Papist Church to differ from the Protestant, as a leproous bodie from one purged from leprosie. And in Defence of his waie c. 37. saith: I neuer denied, The visible Church. the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our Ancestors possessed true faith, and were saved. c. 33. The true Church of God remained in the midst of the Papacie. c. 38. The Reformers answered: The Church of Rome it self was their visible Church: was the visible

42 C. 3. *Prot. confes the Ro. Church.*
Church. See ib. p. 370. And c. 41. We
 profes, that the Roman Church itself in
 al ages to have been the visible Church
 of God. Bunne in his Pacification sec.
 18. *Nether of us (Protestants, Papists)*
maie iustly account the other to be none of
the Church of God. We are no several
Church from them, nor they from us. Pri-
 deaux lec. 9. *This salvation, which with*
great danger maie be expected among
thcs filths, is not to be attributed to their
Additions, but to the foundations which
they (Papists) hold common with us.
 Baro in his 4. Sermons sec. 3. *The Lear-*
neder (Protestant) writers do acknowledg
the Church of Rome, to be the Church of
God. And, The Church (as is evident,
And Chillingw. confesseth p. 265.)
signifieth. the Church Catholik, or the
whole Church : or (as l. Cant. saith)
sec. 20. p. 128. The only true Church. So
 that by the confession of Baro, (which
 is not reiectcd by Morton in his Ap-
 peale l. 4. c. 2:) The Learned Protec-
 tants confes the Roman Church, to be
the whole Church, or the only true Church.
 Butterfield in Defence of Hall. c. 9.

The Church

p. 40. we may iustly say, since the Councel of Trent, as Luther did befor it. That vnder the Poperie is much good, nay al, yea the kernel of Christianitie. Al good vnder the papacie.

3. Potter in his Answer to Charitie, &c. sec. 1. p. 11. we yeeld her (Roman Church) a member of the Catholick Church. A member of the Cath. Church. Sec. 3. p. 74. We acknowledg the Church of Rome, a member of the bodie of Christ. O the bodie of Christ. P. 75. And this cleares vs from the imputation of scisme, whos propertie it is, to cut from the bodie of Christ, and the hope of salvation, the Church from which it separates. Ib. p. 62. The most necessarie and fundamental truths, which constitute a Church, are on both sides unquestioned. Holds the fundamētal truths. And for that reason, learned Protestants yeeld them the name and substance of a Christian Church. p. 66. Protestants, (especially the Church of England) least the Churche of Rome, in nothing, that makes her a Church. Hath the substance of a Church. p. 81. We were neuer disioined from her in thos main essential truths, which give her the name and sence of a Church. The essence. Wherfore when sec. 3. p. 80. he saith, we confes the Church of Rome, to be in some sence a true Church,

44 C. 3. *Prot. confes the Ro. Church.*

he cannot meane, that she is not a true Church in substance and essence, and a member of the bodie of Christ: But that she is not a pure or perfect Church, which now we dispute not. For to my purpose it wil suffice, that she is a true Church in substance, as shal appeare hereafter. Chillingworth in Answer to the Preface p. 16. saith of the Roman Church before Luther: *She was a parte of the whole Church, we grant.* In his Answer to Mercie and Truthe. c. 2. p. 85. *The Roman Church is a parte of the Catholick Church.* p. 88. *The Roman Church is a parte of the Present Church.* C. 5. p. 284. Doctor Potter saies, *Though we separate from you in some things, yet we acknowledg your Church, a member of the bodie of Christ. The very reason for which he (D. Pot.) acquitteth himself from schisme, is, because he holds, that the Church which they forsake, is not cut from the bodie of Christ. This is true. He allowes you to be a parte of the true Church.* C. 7. p. 401. D. Potter saies indeed, *that our not doing so (cutting Papists from the bodie of Christ and*

*A part of
the Cath.
Church.*

to be a true Church. C. 3. 45

hope of salvation) frees us from the
imputation of scisme. L. Laude in his
Relation, &c. sec. 20. p. 129. I granted
the Roman Church, to be a true Church.

A true
Church.

For so much learned Protestants have
acknowledged before me : and the truth
cannot denie it. Sec. 26. p. 192. Protestants
have not least the Church of Rome in her

Truth can-
not denie it.

essence, nor in the things which constitute
a Church. Sec. 35. p. 311. The Roman
Church, and the Church of England are

See sect. 38.
p. 370.

but two distinct members of the Catholik
Church. Sec. 39. p. 376. The Protestant,
and the Roman religion, is the same, nor

The same
religion.

do the Church of Rome, and the Protes-
tants set up a different religion. For the
Christian religion is the same in both. It:
in his epistle to the king : Were not this
so, we should neuer be troubled with that

idle and impertinent question of theirs,
where was your Church before Luther?

This ques-
tion forceth
them to con-

For it was iust there, where theirs is now,
one and the syne Church stil, no doubt of

thes the Ro.
Church.

that; one in substance, but not in condition
of state and puritie. Feild. B. 3. of the

No doubt
of it.

Church c. 6. It is vaine to ask us, where
our Church was before the Reformation

Note the
force of this
question.

46 C.3. Prot.confes the Ro.Church.

The Church
of our Fore-
fathers.

The Church-
es.

undoubtedly
salvation.

The true
Church.

Churches
subiect to
Romish ti-
rannie the
Churches of
God.

began. For it was that, wherim al our
Forefathers lived. And c. 8. Thus then
it appeareth, which we think to have been
the true Church of God, before Luther or
others of that sort were heard of in the
world: namely that, wherim al our Fore-
fathers lived and died. For we most fir-
mely beleve, al the Churches in the world,
wherrin our Fathers lived and died, to
have been the true Churches of God, in
which undoubtedly salvation was to be
found. Ib. c. 46. we doubt not, but the
Church, in which the Bishop of Rome,
with more then Luciferian pride exalted
him self: was notwithstanding the true
Church of God, that it held a saving pro-
fession of the trath in Christ, and by force
therof, did convert manie from error to
the waie of truth. And in his Appendice
par. 3. c. 2. Becaussome perhaps wil think,
that we yeeld more unto our Adversaries
now, then formerly we did, in that we
acknowledg the Latin or western Churches
subiect to Romish Tirannie, before God
raised up Luther, to have been the Chur-
ches of God, in which a saving profession
of the truth in Christ was found, and

to be a true Church. C. 3. 47

wherin Luther himself receaued his Christianitie, ordination, and power of ministerie: I wil first shew, that al our best and most renowned Divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written. Mr Luther confesseth, that much good, naie, that al good, and the verie marrow and kernel of faith, pictie, and Christian belief, was by the happie providence of God, preserved even in the midst of the Papacie. Mr Calvin in like sorte sheweth, that the true Church remained vnder the Papacie: of the same opinion is Bucer, Melancthon, and Beza who saith, the Church was vnder the Papacie. We saie, (saith Philip Morney) that this was the Church, of Christ, Mr Dearing in his Lectures, speaking of the Orders of the Popish Church, hath thes words: In this was the great goodnes of God, that in time to come his children might assuredly know, he reserved to himself a Church, even in the midst of al desolation: and that he called them by his word, and confirmed them by this Sacraments, even as at this daie. Thus do thes worthies write, touching the state of the Christian Church in former

Al best Divines.

l. contra Anabapt.

4. Instit. c. 2. § II.

The true Church.

The Church

The Christian, vnder Anti Christ.

No devine
of worth or
learning
saies the
contrarie.

The Churches.

Saints died
incomunion
of Rome.

48 C. 3. Prot. confes the Ro. Church.

times tyrannically oppressed by Anti-Christ. Nether is there anie of our Divines of worth and learning, for ought I know, that dissentieth from them. And ib. c. 7. p. 34. confesseth, that King James (as is most certaine) in open Parliament acknowledged, the Roman Church to be our Mother Church. And p. 12. I confes, that the Latin Churches, oppressed whith the Romish tirannie, conteined the true Churches of God, held a saving profession of heavenlie truth, turned manie to God, and had manie saints, that died in their communion, even til that time that Luther began. Fox in his Acts p. 5. confesseth that the Church of Rome hath, authoritie to binde and absolue: and that the Scripiure giueth leaue to the Bishop and Church of Rome to minister Sacraments.

4. Thus have we seen, that by the confession of the learnedest sort of Protestants, Lutherans, Calvinists, and English Protestants, the Roman Church, the Popish Church, the faction of Papistrie, Churches which Popish Bishops govern, the Assemblies
of

of Papists, the Latin Church subiect to the Romish tirannie, the Church of our forefathers before Luther or anie of that sort were heard of, that this Church (I saie) is a true Church in essence and substance, is a living Church, a Member of the Catholik Church, a member of the Bodie of Christ, a Spouse of Christ, is in the Covenant of God, is the Church, is the Temple, and Sanctuarie of God, that she hath the verie marrow and kernel of Christianitie, hath profession of saving faith, in which our forefathers were saved, in which vndoubtedly salvation was to be found. And that this is so certaine, as truth canot denie it, that none in their wits can denie it, that al the best and renowned Protestant Divines did ever acknowledg it, and that none of worth and learning denieth it: Now let vs see, that they also confes, that the true Church of God, is but one, whence we shal prove, that theirs is no true Church.

Morton
Appeal l. 1.
c. 5. sec. 2.
*Thes glorious titles
of Spouse of
Christ, and
Cathol.
Church, doe
properly ap-
pertaine to
the faithful
and elect of
God.*

THAT PROTESTANTS
confes, the true Church of God
to be substantially but one.

CHAPTER IV.

I. **T**HAT Protestants generally
confes, that the true Church
of God, is substantially and simply
but one, is evident. For first generally
they profes the Nicen or Constanti-
nople Creed, wherin Christians pro-
fes to beleve *one, holie, Catholik, and*
Apostolik Church. Secondly, becaus in
the publik Confessions of their faith,
they profes the Church to be *one*, and
one only, as is to be seen in the Con-
fession of Auspurg art. 7. Confession
of Swissers c. 17. of Holland art. 27.
of Scotland art. 16. and in the Apolo-
gie of the Church of Englād Thirdly,
becaus their chiefest writers profes,
that the Church is not manie, but one
only. Luther l. contra Papatum to. 7.

fol. 461. Christ knoweth not twoe kinds
of unlike Churches, but one only. Calvin
4. Instit. c. 1. §. 2. we cannot have twoe
or three Churches, but Christ must be de- See whitaker.
vided. Vsher in his Sermon of the vni- con. 2. q. 5.
versalitie of the Church: The Catholik p. 5.
Church is but one. White in his waie p.
138. The Church, is but one Bodie, and
one societie, partaking of the same doctrin,
Sacraments, and worship of God. L. Laude
in his Relation, sec. 35. p. 284. Tis
true, there is but one true faith, and but
one true Church. Sec. 23. p. 147. Christ
gave his natural Bodie to be rent and torne
upon the Cros, that his Mystical Bodie
might be one. Potter in his Answer to
Charitie, &c. sec. 2. p. 22. No Protestant
denies, the Catholik Church to be one.
His labour is lost, in proving the unitie Whitaker
of the Catholik Church, wherof there is no controv 2.
doubt or Controversie. And the same q. 1. c. 10.
faith Chillingworth in Answer to the Amesias l. 2.
Preface p. 7. Lastly, becaus Protestants de Eccl. c. 1.
take it so ill, that we should saie they Iunius l. 3.
put twoe true Churches, as they de Eccl. c. 2.
avaouch it, to be a slander. And how- and others.
soever, in deed and in effect, they doe white d. fef.
c. 38 Field l.
1. c. 10. Mor-
ton impost.
c. 2.

put twoe Churches, in saying, *there is one Visible, an other Invisible*: yea, as manie visible Churches, as they put Churches which are devided voluntarily, ether in some point of faith, or in Communion of Sacraments, for this divisiō is in the essence of the Church: yet it soundeth so harsh in Christian eares, to saie There are twoe or manie true Churches, as commonly Protestants saie in words, the Church is but one, and seldome saie, that there are twoe or manie Churches. But it sufficeth to our purpose, that generally they profes, that the true Church is but one and undevided. For out of that I wil prove, that they having before cōfessed that the Roman Church is a true Church, and here confessing, that the true Church is but one and undevided, must needs confes, that the Protestants Church is no true Church: becaus (as we shal see in the next chapter) the most learned of them confes, that the Roman is not one with the Protest. but substantially devided from the Protestant Church,

as she is evidently, both in profession of faith, and in Communion in Sacraments, and publik worship of God, and also in officers or ministers of the Word of God and of Sacraments. And what sense can there be, that Churches devided in al thes substantial parts, should be one and the same substantial Church?

*THAT MANIE AND
Learned Protestants confes the Ro-
man and Protestant Church,
to be substantially
different.*

CHAPTER V.

1. **T**Hat manie and learned Protestants confes the Roman and Protestant Church to be substantially different, is manifest. First, becaus they directly and expresly auouch it Luther in c. 3. Micheæ to. 4. fol. 446.

54 C. 5. Prot. confes the Roman
 & epist. ad Ellingens. to. 7. fol. 481.
 The Papists doctrin, is diametrically op-
 posit to the Protestant: or (as he speaketh
 respons. ad Scriptum Regis Anglia
 to. 2. fol. 497. It differeth *dis Ἀλτ' ἁπλῶς*.
 Brentius in Apologia pro Confessione
 Wirtenburgensi part. 3. p. 703. Between
 vs (Protestants and Papists) there is
 no such difference, as between Catholiks
 and Heretiks: nor as between Christ and
 Pharisies: but as between Christianitie
 and Anti-Christianitie. For we differ in
 the first Principles. For we have other
 principles then Papists. Wherefore they are
 plainly divers and contrarie kinds of Re-
 ligions. Our first principles, are holie
 Scripture, the Papists, is tradition, &c.
 Calvin de necessitate Reformat. p. 61.
 We contend not (with Papists) about the
 shadowe of an Asse, but the whole summ
 of Religion is called in question. Beza in
 his Confession c. 7. Protestants differ
 from Papists in the summ of Religion.
 Whitaker in oration. *Quod Papa sit*
Anti-Christus: Papacie is more opposit to
 Protestancie, then heat to cold, or white
 to black. Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 5. p.

Opposit
 diametrically.

In the very
 first princ-
 ples.

In the sum
 of Religion.

and Prot. Church to be different. C. 4. 55
 312. Your doctrine is opposit in diameter to
 the doctrine of Protestants. Calvin Res-
 pons. an Versipellem saith that, Pope-
 rie is the Bodie of Satan, and AntiChrist.
 see him 4. instit. c. 2. 9. 2. Whitaker
 contro. 2. q. 6. c. 1. That it is the gulf
 of heresie and error. See more contro.
 2. q. 2. c. 2. p. 459. And commonly al
 Protestants crie, that the Church of
 Rome is the Synagog of Satan, and of
 Anti Christ. Perkins in his Reformed Ca-
 tholik in the epistle dedicatorie: It is *The policie*
 the policie of the Diuel to think, that Pro- *of the diuel.*
 testant Religion, and the religion of the
 present Church of Rome, are al one in sub-
 stance. Feild. l. 3. de Eccl. c. 47. Now
 the Church of Rome it self is heretical. In
 his Appendix 3. parte p. 18. The present
 Roman Church is an heretical Church,
 with which we maie not communicate.
 And p. 47. She is an heretical and Apo-
 statical Church, the Synagog of Satan,
 faction of Anti Christ, and that Babylon,
 out of which we must flie. White in his
 Waie p. 452. The Church of Rome is not
 the Catholik Church, but the seat of Anti-
 Christ.

2. Nether is there anie Protestant Writer of account, in Germanie, Holland, France, or Scotland, who auoucheth, that the Roman and Protestant Church are substantially one and the same Church. And in France, one Millitier, stands excommunicated by the Ministers, for writing some such thing, and seeking to reconcile the twoe Churches.

3. Secondly, they indirectly, (but manifestly) confes that the Roman and Protestant Church differ substantially, in confessing, that they teach different meanes of iustification. For it is of the substāce of the true Church, to teach the true meanes of iustification, or remission of sinns, wher vpon Whitaker Controv. 2. q. 6. c. 3. *The*

Doctrin of iustification most fundamental. *of article of iustification seemeth the chiefeft and most fundamental of al, as the prore and pupp of our salvation. And Calvin Respons. ad Versipellem. Isaias calleth remission of sinns, the doctrin of salvation, and of that, is most eager contention (with Papists.) And it is shewed. l. i. of the Author of Protestancie c. 6. that*

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5. 57

Protestants account iustification by only special faith or confidence, the head, the foundatiō, the life, the soule, the definition of their Church and religion, which special faith the Papists in the Councel of Trent sess. 6. c. 9.

cal vaine and impious : And can. 9. accurse him, that shal saie, that good works cooperate not to iustification. Perkins in his *Reformred Catholik*, contro. 4. p. *Papists condemn the Prot. way of iustification.*

78. *The Papists saie a man is iustified by a general or a Catholik faith, wherby a man beleveth the articles of religion to be true : But we hold, that the faith, which iustifieth, is a particular faith, wherby we applie to ourselues the promise of righteousness, and life everlasting by Christ.* Feild. in his Appendix part. 1. p. 24. *The necessitie of special faith, the Romanists condemn as heretical in the doctrine of our Church.* And how then can the Churches not differ substantially, wherof the one condemneth and accurseth that, which the other accounteth the life and summ of Religion? and which differ in the verie meanes of attaining iustification, or remis-

38 C. 5. *Prot. confes the Roman*
sion of sinns ? See Whitaker loc.
citat.

Ro. and
Pro.Church
differ in
fundamētal
points.

4. Thirdly they indirectly , (but
manifestly also) confes , that the Ro-
man and Protestant Church differ
substantially, in that they saie the Ro-
man Church erreth in Fundamental
points. For fundamental points al
account essential. Calvin Respons. ad
Versipellem : *what stinking babbling is*
this , to saie , the Apostolik doctrin is there
(in the Roman Church) safe for the chie-
fest articles? Whitaker contr. 2. q. 6. c. 3.
The Roman Church hath taken awaie
manie fundamētal articles, and corrupted
faith in the principal point. C. 3. c. 3.
Papists have taken awaie the true worship
of God and turned it into Idolatrie. And
ibid. Poperie is Anti-Christianitie See
him q. 6. c. 1. Perkins in his Reformed
Catholik in fine: The Roman Religion is
against the Catholik principles , and
ground of the Catechisme. Controv. 11.
This point (that the Eucharist is a real
and proper sacrifice) razeth the foun-
dation to the verie botton. Controv. 10.
This corporal presence (of Christ in the

Papist raze
the founda-
tion.

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5. 59
Eucharist) overturnes sundrie articles of
faith. Controv. 4. By her iustification, the
Church of Rome doth raze the verie found-
dation. Controv. 21. We are to make a se-
paration from the present Church of Rome,
in respect of the foundation, and substance
of true Religion. In Galat. 5. v. 9. The
Polititian who is of no religion, saith we
and the Papists do not differ in substance.
Feild in his Appendix, parte 3. p. 6.
The errors of the present Roman Church
are fundamental, nether doth it preach the
word of God, and duly administer the Sa-
craments according to Christs institution,
in al thes things, that of necessitie are re-
quisit to the same. Ib. p. 35. we maie iustly
depart from our Mother Church of Rome, ^{Mother} Church.
becaus she hath forsaken her first faith.
Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 5. p. 263. Where
doth he (D. Potter) saie, that you had,
for the substance, the true preaching of the
word, or due administration of Sacra-
ments? Or where doth he saie, you wanted
nothing fundamental to salvation? p. 281.
As for your pretence, that yours (errors)
are confessed not to be fundamental, it is
an affected mistake, as I have often told

60 C. 5. Prot. confes the Roman

you. p. 289. Your Church did fall into substantial corruptions. And p. 263. 283.

And that no Protestat faith, The Church of Rome, is guiltie of holds other impietie and idolatrie: L. Laude lib. cit. wise see him p. 305. 308. sec. 37. p. 320. The Church of Rome, hath

in the expositions of the Creeds, and Councils, quite changed and lost the sense and meaning of some of them. And ib. p.

319. addeth The Creed is the foundation.

Item p. 321. It is almost apparent by D. Whites Answer, that he never said, that the Church of Rome erred only in points Not fundamental. And sec. 38. p. 325.

You have manie dangerous errors about the foundation, in that you cal the Roman

Fox acts p. faith. Potter lib. cit. sec. 1. p. 11. The

22. This error of the Church of Rome (about justification) is the most pernicious heresie that ever almost crept into the Church. Church of Rome hath manie waies plained the harlot, and in that regard, deserved a bil of divorce, and the detestation of Christians. White in his way p. 449.

Some of the errors of the Church of Rome are capital and substantial. And do not the Churches differ essentially, which differ in fundamental points of religion? Are not fundamental points essential to religion? yea most essential as the fuudamental parts of a building

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5: 61
are most essential.

5. Fourthly they indirectly , (but manifestly) confes , that the Roman and Protestant Church differ substantially , in confessing , that they differ in the rule of faith. For the *only Rule*

of Protestants faith , is the Scripture , as Differ in the rule of faith.
all Protestants teach , and may be seen in L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 38. p. 330. 331.

And Chillingworth maketh the whole second Chapter of his book afore cited to prove , that *Scripture is the only rule , wherby to iudge of Controversies.*

Wheras Papists make their Rule of faith , both Traditions and Scripture , and account , also more books Canonical Scripture , then Protestants do , as is manifest. And can there be any thing more substantial to a Church , then the rule of her faith ? For without

her rule , she cannot be assured , what L. Laude. sec. 38. p. 335.
is right , what is wrong , what true ,

what fals. White in the Preface to his what Scripture is Canonical is a great point of faith.
Waie , when he had repeated , that the Total Rule of our faith , is Scripture

and tradition together , addeth. *This assertion is directly contrary to the doctrine*

62 C. 5. *Proot. confes the Roman
of our Church, and leadeth men into per-
nitious errors. we see, that there is a plaine
difference between the Church of Rome
and vs, in the principal article of our
faith, touching the salvation of our
soules.*

*Rom and
Pro. Church
differ in al
essential
partes.*

*In profession
of faith.*

*In commu-
nion.*

6. Fifthly, they indirectly confes, the Roman and Protestant Church to differ substantially, in that they give such a substantial definition of a true Church, as the Roman and Protestant Church differ in al the formal essential parts therof. For their definition of a Church, is, A Companie agreeing in profession of faith, and in Communion of Sacraments, vnder lawful Ministers. In al which their formal parts, the Roman and Protestant Church do differ. For they disagree in manie and main points of faith, as in Sacraments, in sacrifice, means of iustification, and the like. In communion of Sacraments they wholly disagree. For nether partie communica-teth in Sacraments or publik service of God, with the other: and communion in Sacraments and publik ser-

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5. 63
 vice, is an essential parte of a true
 Church, otherwise, scismatiks should
 be of the true Church. And wholly also
 they differ in Ministers of the Word
 and Sacraments. For Catholiks no
 waie allow Protestant Ministers to be
 lawful Ministers of Gods word or of
 his Sacraments. With what reason
 then can they be said, to be one sub-
 stantial Church, which differ in al the
 substantial formal parts of a Church?
 If scismatiks be rightly said to differ
 substantially from Catholiks, who
 differ only in communion of Sacra-
 ments, how much more Protestants,
 who differ not only in communion in
 Sacraments, but also in profession of
 faith, and ministers or officers of the
 Church?

*See Field 1.
 1. do Eccles.
 c. 2. 3.*

*In Minis-
 ters.*

7. Sixtly, the reason, for which
 some saie, the Roman and Protestant
 Church differ not substantially, is
 both fals and insufficiat, to wit, becaus
 they agree in al the fundamental
 points. For first it is fals, that they
 agree in al fundamental points, as I

*No sufficiẽt
 proof that
 they differ
 not substan-
 tially.*

64 C. 5. *Prot. confes the Roman*
have shewed by the confession of Pro-
testants n. 4. and becaus they differ in
the means of iustification, which to
teach, is most essential to a Church.
Secondly, it is vnsufficient, becaus

See Field l.
2.5.3.

scismatiks agree with Catholiks, not
only in al points fundamental, but in
al points of faith whatsoever, and yet
are not substantially a true Church for
want of communion in Sacraments.
And if agreement in al points of faith,
wil not suffice to make scismatiks of
the same substantial Church with Ca-
tholiks, much les wil the agreement
in fundamental points only, suffice to
make Protestants of the same substan-
tial Church with Catholiks: Besids it
is a fals principle, never proved by
Protestants, that only fundamental
points of faith are substantial or essen-
tial to the true Church. For as the
wals and roof of a house are not fun-
damental partes of the house, and yet
they are substantial and essential
parts: so, secundarie points of faith,
though they be not fundamental, are
nevertheles essential to a Church,
becaus

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5. 65

because they are parts of the * revealed
Word of God, which is the essential
object of faith. And who differ in any
part of the essential object of faith,
differ essentially, because they have
not the same whole essential object:
and habits, which have not the same
whole essential object, cannot be the
same, because habits are distinguished
as their objects are. And to pretend,
that agreement in only fundamental
points is sufficient to the substantial
unity of the Church, against so many
and so main reasons to the contrary,
is to fight against manifest reason, with
a slender pretence of reason: and she-
weth clearly, what great inconve-
niences will follow upon such Protec-
tants, as confess the Roman and Pro-
testant Church to be substantially dif-
ferent, for avoiding of which incon-
veniences, these men will deny them
to be so different. But this is, accor-
ding to the Proverb, to fall into scylla
for to avoid Charibdis. For I assure
myself, that if it were not to avoid those
Atheistical impieties, that the Church

* Vsher
serm. of the
universali-
tie of the
Church.

Faith hath
for its ful
object what
ever is re-
vealed in
the word
of God.

See Potter
sec. 7. p. 71.

see c. 3. n. 39

66 C. 5. *Prot. confes the Roman*
of God was substantially fallen before
Protestants were , and substantially
raised vp by them, which they see not
how they can avoid , if they grant the
Protestants Church to be substantially
different from the Roman (For in like
sort , they must grant it to be substan-
tially differēt from al other Christian,
Churches ancients then themselues,
from whom they onely differ in pro-
fession of faith in communion of Sa-
craments , and Ministers) thes men
would never against so manie and
main reasons, vpon such slender pre-
tence of reason, saie , that thes Church-
es differ not substantially. But for to
avoid thos Atheismes , they would in-
cur into gros absurdities in Philoso-
phie, and into heresie in Divinitie , as
to affirme, that Churches so differing
as the Roman and Protestant differ,
are substantially one and the same
Church. But farewell that Church,
which cannot be defended, but ether
by Atheisme , or absurditie in Philo-
sophie , and heresie in Divinitie. But
out of al the Potestants Confessions

and Prot. Ch. to be different. C. 5. 67

hitherto related, we have, first, that 1.
the Roman Church is a true Church:
Secondly, that there are not manie 2.
true Churches substantially different.
Thirdly, that the Protestant Church 3.
is substantially different from the Ro-
man, whence evidently followeth,
that the Protestant Church is no true
Church. And thus having heard the
Confessions of Protestants, that the
Roman Church is a true Church: Let
vs heare their like Confessions, that
she hath saving faith.

*That manie and learned Protestant
confes, that the Roman Church
hath saving faith.*

CHAPTER VI.

1. **T**Hat Protestants must confes,
that the Roman Church hath
saving faith, is evident by their Con-
fession, that she is a true Church. For *See Luther*
doubtles a true Ch. hath saving faith, *supra c. 3.*
els how should she be a true Church. *n 1.*

68 C.6. Prot. confes the Ro. Church
of God: Wherefore Feild in his Appen-
dix part. 1. p. 2. saith, *that the visible
Church is free from damnable error, we
willingly grant. But besides this, they
confes it expressly. For thus Luther in
c. 41. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 549. Under
Poperie we had the word, and doubtles
manie were saved in the faith therof. And
(as we cited before c. 3. n. 1. he saith,
Under Poperie is true Christianitie: yea
the true kernel of Christianitie, and Pope-
rie hath the true spirit, Gospel, faith, and
all things that Christianitie ought to have.
Whitaker contro. 4. q. 5. c. 3. Among
them (Papists) is a certaine ministerie,
and some, preaching of the word, which
without doubt, availeth manie to salva-
tion. Hal. 1. of old Religion in fine.
The Latin or western Church, subiect to
the Romish tirannie: was a true Church,
in which a saving faith of the truth of
Christ was found. Morton in his Impo-
sture c. 15. Some dying in the Church of
Rome, for their faith in Christ, maie be in
state of life. And in his Appeal. 1. 4. c. 2.
sec. 5. And so much les maie we despaire of
some of the members of the Roman Church.*

*Doubtles
manie saved
in faith of
Poperie.*

*Faith avai-
ling to sal-
vation.*

*A saving
faith.*

to have saving faith. C. 6 69

by how much more evident it is, by their practice at the howr of their death, even then when they presume that they are to performe the act of martyrdom, they renouncing al confidence of their perfectnes, do cast anker upon the mercie of God in Christ, for the ful remission of sinns. And

1.3.c.18. sec. 1. We maie grant, that God doth cooperate with them (Papists) to the Conversion of Infidels, so far as the Gospel of Christ, which is the power of God to salvation, is preached by them. Feild l.

3. of the Church c. 47. Some of the Roman Church are in that degree of orthodoxie, as we maie wel hope of their salvation. White in Defense in his waie c.

37. I never denied the Roman Church to be the visihle Church of God, in which our Ancestors held true faith, and were saved. True saving faith in the Ro. Church.

And in his waie p. 435. In the Church of Rome, known by that name, and in no other in the western parts, were the true Scriptures, Sacraments, callings, and successions, and everie part of the true faith, and necessarie doctrin. Potter lib. cit. sec.

Everie part of true faith.

3. p. 58. Protestant Reformation did not change the substance of religion. D. An-

70 C.6. *Prot.confes the Ro.Church*
drews Respons. ad Apol. Bellarmini,
c.1.34. *The faith which was, remained the*
same, onely errors (perhaps besids faith)
in doctrin needed reformation. L. Laude
sec. 39. p. 376. The Protestant and the
Roman religion is the same : nor do the
Church of Rome and the Protestants , set
up a different religion. For the Christian
Religion is the same in both. And if it be
the same religion , I hope they wil not
denie , but it hath saving faith : vnles
they wil denie their own religion to
have saving faith. K. Iames in his
speech to be Parlement 9. Nouemb.
1605. we do iustly confes , that manie Pa-
pists , (especially our forefathers) saying
their only trust vpon Christ and his me-
rits , maybe , and often times are saved:
detesting in that point , and thinking the
crueltie of Puritans worthie of fire , that
wil admit no salvation to anie Papist.
Besids , manie (as we shewed c. 3.)
confes that the Roman Church in our
forefathers times , was a true Church,
and that our forefathers were saved in
her faith. And it were Impudencie to
saie , that the faith of the Roman

to have saving faith. C. 6. 71

Church of that time, and of this, are not the same.

*See Montag.
Gag p. 50.
Butterfield*

2. Thus we see, learned Protestants confesse, that Poperie hath faith, hath the verie kernel of Christianitie, hath al that Christianitie ought to have, hath such preaching of the Word, as doubtles availeth manie to salvation, hath a saving faith, some dying in the Roman Church are saved for their faith, doth preach the Gospel of Christ, which is the power of God to salvation that in the Roman Church our Ancestors held true faith, and were saved, that the Protestants Reformation did not change the substance of religion, that the Roman Church and Protestants hold the same Religion; so that if Protestants have a saving faith, Papists must have it. For without saving faith, it were not the same religion.

3. The same also is manifest by what they confesse, that the Roman Church holdeth al the fundamental points of faith, and adde, that the fundamental points are sufficient, are

72 C. 6. Prot. confes the Ro. Church abundantly sufficient to saving faith, al that is necessarie to faith and comprehend the life and substance of saving faith. For thus Iunius contro. 5. l. 3. c. 19. speaking of Papists and Protestants: *we agree in the essential foundation.* Zanchius Præfation, l. de natura Dei; *Maugre Satan, that (Roman) Church hath kept the chief foundations of faith.* Boyssoul in confutation of spond. p. 79. *I acknowledg, that she is pure in the chief articles of Christian religion.* Cameron de Ecclesia c. 38. *we confes, that for the substance of Christian religion, that is this daie amongst them (Papists) Spalatensis contra Suarem c. 1. n. 5. True Catholiks faith was not quite banished, but florished in our (Roman) Church, even before the Reformation, and that, as true in the fundamenls, did bring us forth, Thus forraine Protestants.*

Essential foundation.

The substance of Christian religion.

Papists hold the foundation.

4. As for English Protestants. King James in his Monitorie Epistle p. 143. confesseth, that Papists cleave to the foundations of the true ancient, Catholik, and Apostolik faith. Hooker l. 3. of Ecclesiastical Politie p. 188. *They*

to have saving faith. C. 6. 73

constantly hold the chief parts of Christian truth. Perkins in the Preface of his Reformed Catholik : By a Reformed

The chief
partes of
Christiani-
tie.

Catholik, I understand, anie one, who holds the same necessarie heads of religion

with the Roman Church, yet so, &c. Morton in his Appeal l. 3. c. 18. we di-

The necessa-
rie heads.

stinguish between the Apostolical truth, which they (Papists) with us do profes, and thir corruptions. White in defense

The Aposto-
lical truths.

of his waile c. 38. we agree with them in the substantial articles of faith. Ib. The

The sub-
stantial
articles.

Church of Rome it self was the visible Church professing as they did, in al things

substantial. c. 40. Protestants have seen the continuance of true religion in al ages

in the Church of Rome. Hal in his Rome irreconcil. She is one, for the common

articles of faith, which she holds with us

--- As she holds the foundation, she is a Church. Potter lib. citat. sect. 3. p. 62.

The most necessarie and fundamental truths, which constitute a Church; are on

both sides (Papists Protestants) un-

questioned. P. 81. we were never disioined from her, in the main essential truths, which give her the name and essence of a

The funda-
mental
truthes.

74 C. 6. Proot. confes the Ro. Church

The life and substance of religion. Church. P. 59. 60. The things, wherein Protestants iudge the life and substance of religion to be comprised, their Adversaries

The prime grounds.

(Papists) themselves do avow, and receave them, as wel as they P. 58. In the prime grounds or principles of Christian Religion, we have not forsaken the Church of Rome. Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 3. p. 163. we hope she (Roman Church) errs not fundamentally---The Scripture puts vs in hope, she errs not fundamentally. P. 164.

Erred not fundamentally.

The only and main reason, why we beleve you not to err fundamentally, is your holding the doctrins of faith in Christ, and repentance. c. 7. p. 401. we approve thos fundamental and simply ncessarie truths, which you retaine, by which some good soules among you, maie be saved, which he repeateth p. 404. L. Laude lib. cit. fec. 35. p. 299. Romanists, as they are

Hold the foundation.

Christians, that is, as they beleve the Creed, and hold the foundation, Christ him self, I dare not proceed so roughly, as to denie or weaken the foundation, which is Christ even among them, and which is and remaineth holie even in the midst of their superstitions. Vsher in his Reio-

Synge

inder p. 27. we charge you not, for determining against thos Catholik fundamental truths, which were originally and universally receaved. P. 29. Nether do we saie, they have forsaken the faith absolutely: for they profes it, but the puritie of it. And the same must al Protestants confes, who saie, that the Creed of the Apostles conteineth the foundation or fundamental points of faith. Which commonly Protestants saie, as maie beseen in Calvin 2. Instit. c. 16. §. 8. Beza de Notis Eccl. Whitaker l. 3. de Script. c. 3. Potter sect. 3. and 7. Chillingworth c. 1. and 4. L. Laude sec. 10. and 27. and others. For it can be but impudently denied, that the Roman Church beleveth the Apostles Creed: and L. Laude in the words now cited sec. 35. confesseth it. Thus have we heard, learned Protestants confes, that the Roman Church holdeth the essential foundation: the substance of Christian Religion: is true in the fundamental points: constantly holdeth the cheif parts of Christian truth: the necessarie heads of religion: the most

see Montagu
Gag. p. 41.
Fox q. 2.
Prot. are
baptised in
the same
bbleef, and
be true the
same articles
of the creed
are do.

76 C. 8. Prot. confes the R^d. Church
necessarie truths: the substantial arti-
cles of faith: the main essential truths:
the things in which the substance and
life of religion is comprized: holdeth
the foundation: erreth not in funda-
mental and simply necessarie truths.

Faith
enough.

Abundantly
sufficient.

Onely
necessarie.

5. Now, that such a Church, as
holdeth the fundamental points of
faith, and erreth not in them, hath
saving faith, is manifest by what they
teach of fundamental points. For first
they saie, that *fundamental* points are
sufficient, naie abundantly sufficient,
to saving faith: and *Not fundamental*
points, not necessarie Andrews Res-
pons. ad Apolog. Bellarm. c. 1. What
is in the creeds, and in the 4. Councils, is
faith enough for vs. Potter lib. cit. sec. 3.
p. 69. The main Positive truths, wherin
al (Protestants, Papists) agree are
abundantly sufficient to salvation. L.
Laude lib. cit. sec. 38. p. 372. The Church
can teach the foundation, and men were
happie, if they could learne it, and the
Church more happie, would she teach no-
thing but that, as necessarie to salvation.
For certainly nothing but that, is neces-

to have saving faith. C. 6. 77

farie. Chillingworth in Answer to the Preface n. 32. They are not fundamental points, which are not necessarie. c. 4. p. 219. By fundamental points, we mean althos, that are necessarie. p. 22. By fundamental, we meane al and only that, which is necessarie. And L. Laude sec. 21. p. 141. calleth Not fundamental points: By, and Vnnecessarie Truths. And generally Protestants put puritie in fundamental points, the essential and vndoubted Note of a true Church. Wherefore, if the Roman Church hold al the fundamental points, she holdeth al that is sufficient, and abundantly sufficient to saving faith, and al that is necessarie to it. And to imitate Chillingworths words lib. cit. p. 220. cit. I hope, we maie safely expect saving faith in a Church, that hath al things necessarie to saving faith: unlessse you will say, that more is necessarie to saving faith, then is necessarie to it. Likewise, if Not fundamental points be vnnecessarie to saving faith: and as Potter saith sec. 2. p. 39. And L. Laude sec. 38. p. 355. 360. Breach in them, be no breach in saving faith, though the Roman Church should err in them, yet

what hath
al necessa-
ries, is sa-
ving faith,
No breach
in saving
faith.

78 C. 6. *Prot. confes the Ro. Church*
 she should not leese saving faith.
 Besids L. Laude faith sec. 10. p. 28. *A*
true foundation, is firme vnder al: And
 sec. 35. p. 282. *The foundation can de-*
ceave no man that rests vpon it. Seing
 therefore, by the confessions of Pro-
 testants, the Roman Church cōstantly
 rests vpon the foundation of saving
 faith, it cannot want saving faith. Se-
 condly, becaus Protestāts do not only
 teach, that fundamental points are
 sufficient, and alone necessarie to sa-
 ving faith: but they ad also, that they
 make vp and integrate saving faith,
 and are the only essential parts of it.
 And none can want saving faith, who
 hath al that is essential to it, and al
 which makes vp the substance of it.
 Potter lib. cit. sec. 7. p. 76. faith of fun-
 damental points: *They make vp our faith*
in Christ. p 78. Make vp the Catholik
and Apostolik faith, that faith, which es-
entially cōstitutes a true Christian. p. 102.
In them consists the vnitie of faith. Sec.
2. p. 39. discord (in Not fundamentals)
dissolues not the vnitie of faith. And ib.
p. 60. In them, the life and substance of

Fundamen-
tals make
vp faith.

to have saving faith. C. 6. 79
religion is comprized. Chillingworth
lib. cit. c. 3. p. 154. writeth, that funda-
mental points *integrate and make up*
the bodie of Christian Religion. And ib. p.
140. saith, *Not fundamental (id est)*
Not essential part of Christianitie. And
L. Laude before cited, error in Not
fundamentals, *is no breach in saving*
faith. Wherefore so long as Protestants
confes, that the Roman Church hol-
deth the fundamental points, they
cannot saie, that she hath not saving
faith, or that she maketh anie breach
in saving faith, what breach soever she
maie be pretended to make in not fun-
damental points.

6. Thirdly, becaus Protestants
teach, that no error, but only in funda-
mental points, is damnable. Where-
fore the Roman Church, which they
confes not to err in fundamental
points, erreth not damnably. And if
she err not damnably, she hath saving
faith: becaus saving faith is not lost
but by damnable error in faith. Whi-
taker contr. 2. q. 5. c. 18. *If an here-*
tik must be excluded from salvation, that
No dānable
heresie but
against fun-
damentals.

20 C. 6. Brot. confes the Ro. Church
is, becaus he overthroweth some founda-
tion. For vnles he overthrow some founda-
tion, he maie be sau'd. Morton in his
Imposture c. 15. Nether do Protestants
yeeld more safetie to anie of the mēbers of
the Church of Rome in such a case, then
they do to whatsoever heretiks, whos
beleif doth not undermine the fundamen-
tal doctrin of faith. So they yeeld sal-
uation to whatsover heretik doth not
undermine the fundamentals. Potter
sec. 7. p. 111. Even in an heretical Church,
saluation maie be had. Chillingworth c.
4. p. 209. There are no damnable heresies,
but such as are plainly repugnant to this
prime veritie. p. 215. There can be no
damnable heresie, vnles it contradict some
necessarie truth. And ib. p. 219. and 220.
professeth, by Fundamental, to meane
Al, and only that, which is necessarie.
And by plainly repugnant, he cannot
meane, that which only is indirectly
repugnant to prime verities. For so al
heresies should be damnable: becaus
al indirectly are repugāt to this prime
veritie: Al is true, that God revealeth:
but he must meane such heresies, as
are

are directly repugnant to prime verities, as were the heresies of Arius, Manichees, and such like. And such heresies the Roman Church cannot be pretended to have. Therefore she hath saving faith. And this is confirmed, by what we shall cite hereafter out of Protestants confession, that the errors of the Church of Rome are not damnable to such as beleve them, and that she hath an antidote against all errors.

Finally L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 38. p. 325.

faith: to beleve the Scripture, and the Creeds, to beleve thes in the sēse of the ancient Primitiue Church, to receaue the fowr great general Councels, to beleve all points of doctrine generally receaued in the Church of Christ, is a faith, in which to live and die, cannot but give salvation.

*what faith
giueth sal.
nation.*

The like hath Potter sec. 1. p. 7. And it cannot be but impudently denied, that the Roman Church beleveth all thes.

7. Moreover, that Protestants must grant, that the Roman Church hath saving faith, is evident by what they teach, that iustification of Papists

*Luther cited
by Feild 2.
part. Appēd.
p. 3. Here I
saie thus*

82 C. 7. *Prot. confes the Ro. Church*

which al
saie, that
other mens
faith, even
the faith of
such as pre-
sent them to
baptisme,
steedeth lit-
tle Children.

Children, is applied to them by the
faith of their Parents. For vnles the
faith of their Papish parents were sa-
ving or iustifying faith, it could not
applie or procure iustification to their
Children. Morton in his Appeal l. 6.
c. 4. saith, that *this is the most spetious
obiection, which is brought by Mr Brierly.*
But in truth his Answer to it, is nothing
spetious, which is, that the child is in-
teressed only in that part of the parents
faith, which is sound and Catholik,
whiles the Parents themselues stand
guiltie of heresies, which they have,
by their own consent, added to the
truth.

Sauing
faith and
heresie can-
not stand
together.

Potter sec. 7.
p 71. Vsher
serm. of
universali-
tie of the
Church.
VWhitaker
l. 1. de Script.
c ult. sec 12.
p. 175.

8. The first absurditie in this Answer,
is, that it putteth in the same man, sa-
ving faith and heresie. For sauing
faith beleueth al Gods Word suffi-
ciently proposed: And otherwise it is
not saving faith. For this is the obiect
of saving faith, as is evident, and Pro-
testants confes. And heresie is an vn-
beleif or disbeleif of some word of
God sufficiently proposed. And it is
plaine contradiction, to beleve al

Gods Word sufficiently proposed, and
to not beleve some of Gods Word
sufficiently proposed. The second
absurditie, is, to saie, that one can be ^{who hath}
damned for error in faith, who hath ^{saving faith}
saving faith. For how is it saving faith, ^{cannot be}
if it cannot save a man for al matters ^{damned for}
of faith? Surely such a faith is but a ^{want of}
parte of saving faith, and not entire ^{faith.}
saving faith. If one have saving grace,
how can he be damned for sin?

9. Finally evident it is, that Pro-
testants generally do, and must con-
fes, that there is saving faith in the
Roman Church, becaus (as we shal
see beneath) they confes, there is sal-
vation in the Roman Church: and al
of them are ashamed to saie that al our ^{See c. 3. n. 1.}
Catholik Ancestors were damned, as ^{2. 3.}
they must needs be, if they had not
saving faith.

That most and the learnedest Protestants confes, saving faith, to be substantially but one.

CHAPTER VII.

1. **T**Hat Protestants confes, that saving faith is substantially but one, and not manie, is evident, by what before we rehearsed of their confessions, that the true Church is substantially but one. For if saving faith were substantially manie, the Church also must be substantially manie. But besids, they expresly confes, that saving faith is substantially but one. Luther in c. 7. Matthei to 5. fol. 74. *Faith must be round, that is, in al articles beleving howsoever little matters. For who doth not rightly beleve one article, doth not bcleve right in the rest, as S. Iames saith: who offendeth in one, is guiltie of al.* Calvin in 4. Ephes. v. 5.

*True faith
beleueth
euem little
matters.*

vpon thes words : One God, one faith : as
often as thou readeſt the word, (one) vn-
derſtand it put emphatically , as if he ſaid,
Chriſt cannot be devided, faith cannot be
parted. Perkins in explicat. Symboli
colum. 512. Thus indeed fareth the mat-
ter, that a man failing in one article, fai-
leth and erreth in al, wherupon faith is
termed, an entire copulative. Spalatensis
contra Suarem c. i. n. 7. Divine faith
perisheth wholly, by the leaſt detraction.
L. Laude lib. cit. ſec. 38. p. 325. This is
true, that there is but one ſaving faith.
Ib. p. 338. That there is but one faith, I
confeſs with S. Paul Ephes. 4. And p. 342.
I agree, that he who hopes for ſalvation,
muſt, beleve the Cathalik faith whole and
entire in euerie point. Sec. 35. p. 286.
Tis' true, that there is but one true faith,
and but one true Church. Sec. 16. p. 105.
we yeeld our ful and firme aſſent, not only
to the articles, but to al the things rightly
deduced from them, as we do to the moſt
evident principles of natural reaſon. This
aſſent, is called faith. White in his waie
p. 2. we al agree, there is but one faith,
wherin we can be ſaved. Potter lib. cit.

Cannot be
parted.

Is an entire
copulative.

Is but one.

whole and
entire.

Aſſenteth to
al rightly
deduced.

86 C. 7. *Prot. testes saving faith*
fec. 2. p. 38. and 39. *This unitie (of the*
Church) consists in unitie of faith, and
in union of mens hearts and affections by
true charitie. Vsher in his sermon of
the vniuersal tie of the Church p. 12.
The Catholik Church, is but one, and the
principal reason for which it is accounted
one, is the unitie of faith professed therein.
And thus expressly they teach in gene-
ral, that faith is but one : but more
particularly they ad also, that faith is
one in al fundamētal points, and even
in not fundamental points, if they be
sufficiently proposed, and also in its
formal obiect.

Faith is one
in al funda-
mental
points.

2. That saving faith is one, and
vndevided in fundamental points,
thus Vsher in his sermon of the vni-
versallitie of the Church p. 14. *The*
Apostle maketh distinction betwixt the
foundation, and that which is built ther-
upon: betwixt the principles of the doctrin
of Christ and that, which he calleth per-
fection. The unitie of faith, and the
knowledg of the sonn of God, hath refe-
rence to the foundation, as that which fol-
loweth of a perfect man; And the measure

of the stature of the fulnes of Christ, to the superstruction and perfection. In the former, there is a general unitie among al true Belevers, in the latter, a great deale of varietie. Potter lib. cit. sec. 7. p. 75. Fundamental, properly, is that, which Christians are obliged to beleve by an expres and actual faith. p. 73. By Fundamental doctrins, we meane such Catholik verities, as principally and essentially pertain to the faith. And sec. 2. p. 40. he hath the like: Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 4. p. 193. Fundamental truths are not only plainly revealed by God, but also commanded to be preached to al, and to be beleved distinctly by al.

see Field
l. 3. c. 3.

3. They confes also that saving faith is one in al points of faith sufficiently proposed. Potter lib. cit. sec. 4. p. 95. He is iustly esteemed an heretik, becaus he yeelds not to Scripture sufficiently propounded, and cleared vnto him. Ib. p. 124. An obstinat standing out against evident Scripture sufficiently cleared vnto him, makes an heretik. Sec. 7. p. 105. 106. It seemes fundamental to the faith, and for the salvation of everie

And in al
that one
sufficiently
proposed.

88 C. 7. Prot. confes saving faith.
member of the Church, that he acknowledg
and beleve al such points of faith, as
whereof he maie be sufficiently convinced,
that they belong to the doctrin of Iesus-
Christ. For he that being sufficiently con-
vinced, doth oppose, is obstinat, an heritik,
and finally such a one, as excludes him self
out of heauen, wherinto no wilful sinner
can enter. Ib. p. 110. 111. Where the re-
vealed wil of God is sufficiētly propounded,
there he that opposeth, is cōvinced of error,
and he, who is thus convinced, is an
heretik. And hence it followeth, that it
is fundamental to a Christians faith, and
necessarie for his salvation, that he beleve
al revealed truths that they are from God.
Ib. p. 75. In other points (Not funda-
mental) maie suffice an humble prepara-
tion of minde, to beleve al or anie thing
revealed in Scripture, when it is suffi-
ciently cleared. p. 74. It is true, what-
soever is revealed in Scripture, or pro-
pounded by the Church out of Scripture, is
in some sense, fundamental, in regard of
the divine authoritie of God, and his
word, by which it is recommended, that
is, such, as maie not be denied or contra-

dicted without Infidelitie. Chillingworth in Answer to the Preface p. 10. repeateth and alloweth the foresaid words of Potter p. 105. And addeth p. 11. *that to denie and disbeleve anie point of faith sufficiently proposed, is to give God the lie.* And c. 4. p. 193. *faith of Not fundamental: such are to be beleved, becaus they are ioined with others, that are necessarie to be beleved, and delivered by the same authoritie, that delivered thes.* p. 196. *The main question in this busines, is not, what divine revelations are necessarie to be beleved, or not reiected, when they are sufficiently proposed. For al without exception, al without question are so.* c. 3. p. 138. *You infer out of D. Potters words, that al errors are alike damnable, if the manner of proposing the contrarie truths, be not different, which, for ought I know, al Protestants grant, and al that have sense, must grant. So it is against sense, to think, that one can have saving faith, and yet err in anie point of faith propounded alike as fundamentals are, or ought to be, that is, as sufficiently, as they.*

*And also in
its formal
object.*

4. Finally they confes, that faith is al one and vndevided in its formal obiect, and that divine revelation, is the formal obiect of saving faith. L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 38. p. 343. *I agree, that a man, that wil besaved, must beleve the whole creed for the true formal reason of divine revelation p. 344. We beleve them for the same formal reason in al, namely, becaus they are revealed by God, and sufficiently applied in his word, and by his Churches ministration. Potter lib. cit. sec. 5. p. 3. The formal reason or principal ground, on which faith cheifly relies, is divine revelation. Ib. The formal obiect or reason of faith, is only divine revelation. p. 10. The cheif principal or ground, on which faith rests, is divine revelation made in Scripture. Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 1. p. 35. I conceaue faith, an assent to divine revelations, upon the authoritie of the Revealer. If therfore anie differ in anie revealed truths sufficiently proposed, or whos revelation is sufficiently proposed, he differeth in the formal obiect, of saving faith: and differing in the formal obiect,*

and Prot. to be different. C. 8. or
he must needs differ essentially in
faith.

*That manie and learnedest Protestants
confes, the saving faith of the
Roman Church, and of Protestants,
to be substantially different.*

CHAPTER VIII. *

1. **T**Hat manie, and the learnedest
Protestants confes, the saving
faith of the Roman Church, and of
Protestants, to be substantially diffe-
rent, is evident. First by their words
before related c. 5. That their Reli-
gions are diametrically opposit: that
they differ in the first principles, and
in the summ of Religion: That Pope-
rie is the bodie of Satan, and of Anti-
Christ, and the gulf of heresies. And
Perkins in his epistle dedicatorie of his
Reformed Catholik faith: *It is a no-*
table politic of the diuel, which he hath,
to put into the heads of sundrie men in this

*Politic of
the diuel.*

92 C. 8. *Prot. confes the Ro. faith.*
age, to think, that our, (Protestant) re-
ligion, and the religion of the present
Church of Rome are al one for substance.
 Secondly, becaus they confes (as
 there is related) that they differ in
 fundamental points: But fundamen-
 tal points are substantial and essential
 points, as is evident, and themselues
 confes. Thirdly, becaus (as is there
 shewed) they differ in the meanes of
 iustification: And what can be more
 substantial to saving faith, then the
 true meanes of iustification? The
 meanes of iustification by the Roman
 faith, is Catholik or Common faith
 and good works: the meanes of iusti-
 fication by Protestants, is nether good
 works, nor Catholik or Common
 faith, such as al Christians have of the
 mysteries of faith, but a special faith,
 peculiar to everie one that is iustified,
 which hath this special obiekt, that his
 sins are forgiven, or not imputed to
 him, which no other faithful beleveth
 of him, but himself alone: Danæus
 controvers. 1. p. 29. *only special faith doth*
iustifie. Perkins in his Catholik Re-

*Differ in
 the means
 of iustifica-
 tion.*

*Protestants
 iustified by
 special
 faith.*

formed Controv. 3. p. 39. *A man maie* ^{See Field 3. c. 44. and sup. c. 5. n. 3.}
be certaine of his saluation by special faith.
Ib. p. 45. *True faith, is a particular assurance of the remission of sins. Item: True faith, is a certaine assurance of Gods mercie to that partie, in whom it is. And contr.*
4. p. 78. *The Papist, saying, that a man is iustified by faith, understandeth a general or Catholik faith, wherby a man beleveth the articles of Religion to be true: But we hold, that the faith, which iustifieth, is a particular faith. The Apologie of the Confession of Auspurg c. de Pænitent. Remission of sins, comes by spccial faith, wherwith everie one beleveth, that to himself sins are forgiven. This is the cheifest article.*

2. Fourthly, becaus they auouch, that the Roman Church differeth frō the Protestants, in points of faith sufficiently proposed. Potter lib. cit. c. 5. ^{Differ in}
p. 26. *The Protestants expresly accuse this* ^{points of}
(Roman) Church, and have convicted ^{faith sufficiently}
her too, as they think, of manie gros and ^{proposed.}
dangerous errors. p. 14. She is sensles of her errors, and careles to scek anie Remedie. And sec. 3. p. 65. Thee first Reformers

94 C. 6. *Prot. confes the Ro. faith.*

saw Rome in love with her errors, so as she would not be cured. Chillingworth lib. cit. c. 6. p. 373. The Roman Church is accused, and convicted of manie damnable errors. c. 3. p. 303. Papists are obstinat in their common superstition. L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 21. p. 144. They are resolved to alter nothing. Morton in his Imposture p. 404. To heresie and idolatrie, your Church hath ioined obstinacie. And conviction of errors, cannot be, but where is sufficient Proposal of the contrarie truths. And where there is difference in points of faith sufficiently proposed, there is substantial differēce in faith, as is shewed in the former chapter.

*Differ in
articles of
the creed.*

3. *Fiftly, becaus they differ in some articles of the Apostles creed. For some Protestants in plaine words denie God to be Almighty. Beza contra Hesus vol. 1. p. 299. That saying of thine: al things are possible to God, hath some exception. Calvin Respons. ad Nebul. p. 730. Calvin vehemently reiecteth that fiction of Gods absolute power. Martyr contra Gardiner col.*

and Prot. to be different. C.8. 95

199. Gods power doth not reach to the
kind of things. Sadeel ad artic. 14.
abiurat: Gods omnipotēcie doth not beare,
that Christs bodie should be at once in dif-
ferent places. Tilenus in Syntagmate
c. 7. It repugneth to Gods power in work-
ing miracles, that Christs bodie should
haue penetrated the dores. Gratianus
Antilesuita parte 1. c. 5. we saie, that
God is so Almighty, as he cannot do thes
things, that Christs flesh should be in
the Sacrament. And in effect, al Cal-
vinists denie God to be almightie,
whiles they denie, that God can make
Christs bodie and blood of bread and
wine, or put his bodie at once in dif-
ferent places, or to w bodies in one
place.

4. They also denie in very deed
and effect that article, that Christ was
borne of a Virgin, in that they teach,
that Christ was not borne of his mo-
ther, her womb being close: but that
he opened it in the same manner, as
other children open their Mothers
womb. For doubtles, corporal
Virginitie consisteth in the closure,

*Prot. denie
Christ to be
born of a
virgin.*

96 C. 8. *Prot. confes the Ro. faith*
or' integritie of a virgins womb.
Whervpon S. Augustin in Enchir. c. 34.

S. Ambros.
de Instit.
Virg. c. 8.
Porta clau-
sa, virgini-
tas.

saieth: If by his birth, her integritie was
corrupted, he was not born of a virgin:
And the Church should falsly, (which
God forbid) confes, that he was born of
the Virgin Marie. And l. 4. contra
Iulian. c. 8. Chastitie is a thing of the
minde, virginitie, of the bodie. Now
that Protestants teach, that Christ was
born, his mothers womb not remain-
ing clos, is evident. For thus Whi-
taker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 18. That Christ
was born, the wōb being close, is a blemish.
Chamier l. 4. de Christo c. 3. Papists
denie, that Christs bodie came out, after
the common manner of men, but the womb
being wholly close. Nether can Prote-
stants saie other, becaus they denie,
that Christs bodie could penetrate
his mothers womb, and therfore in
issuing out, he must needs open it lo-
cally, as other children do.

5. Another article of the creed,
Prot. beleue which commonly Protestants denie
not the (to omit, that manie of them denie
Ca. h. Chur. the local descent of Christs soule into
hel)

hel) is *The Catholik Church*. For the Catholik Church, which they profes to beleve, is the Masse of al Christians, who beleve the Capital points of Christianitie, howsoever they wittingly differ in other points of faith, and wholly in Communion of Sacraments and publik worship of God, and in ministers of the word and Sacraments. Which Catholik Church, is a mere monster, fiction, and chymera of their own devise, never instituted by Christ, never thought of by the holie Fathers, and plainly repugnant to their owne definitions of the true Church, to wit, a societie of such, as profes the pure Word of God, with right cōmunion of Sacraments, vnder lawful ministers. For the Catholik Church, is not a multitude of heretiks and scismatiks, as manie are, who hold the fundamental points: but is a multitude of Catholiks only, as the verie name *Catholik*, sheweth. Which is opposit both to scismatiks, and heretiks: whom Christ, the Apostle, and holie Fathers bid vs flie and avoid:

L. I. aud sec.
16. p. 62.

Potter sec. 5.
p. 18.

Confes
Angl. art.

19.

S. Patian.
epif. 7.

S. Aug. de
ver. rel c. 7.

cont. epif.

fundam. c. 4.

V Whitaker

cont. 2. q. 5.

c. 2.

Field l. 2.

c. 9.

98 C. 8. *Prot. confes the Ro. faith*
 and such are no part of the Catholik
 Church, which they bid vs beleve and
 follow. Nether is it anie multitude
 whatsoever, but a multitude vnited in
 profession of faith, and communion
 of Sacraments vnder lawful officers.
 And such is not the multitude of al
 thos, who hold al fundamentals. For
 such are disvnited wholly in cōmunion
 of Sacraments, and officers, and not
 vnited in profession of Christs faith,
 but only in profession of one part of
 his faith, to wit, of the fundamental
 parte. Hence S. Patianus said epistle 1.
That Catholik, is everie where one. And
 S. Hierom epist. ad Damasum. *The*
Catholik faith, is the same throughout the
world. And S. Augustin put this diffe-
 reñce between heretiks and Catholiks,
 that though both be through the
 world, yet Catholiks were the same
 everie where; heretiks, different. And
 in the Nicen creed we are taught ex-
 pressly to profes, not only the Catho-
 lik Church, but also that she is *one only*:
 as surely she is not, which is manie or
 devided in communion of Sacramēts,

Cont.
 crescon. l. 3.
 c. 67. l. 4.
 z. 61.

and Prot. to be different. C. 8. 69

and officers, and in Not fundamental points of faith sufficiently proposed.

6. An other article of the creed, which Protestants commonly, in effect do denie, is *Remission of sins*. Beza in Matth. 6. v. 12. *To remit sins, is no other thing, then not to exact the punishment.*

Remission of punishment, is not remission of sin.

Piscator in Thesibus l. 1. p. 428. *The Remission of the fault, is no other thing, then not to punish for the fault.* Moulines contra Peron contr. 7. c. 1. p. 707. *To remit sinns, is to exempt the sinner from punishment.* Vorstius in Anti-Bellarmin. p. 469. *The forgiveness of sin, is nothing els, but the remission of the punishment.* And the same saie al Protestants, who teach, that in remission of sins, the sin it self is not taken awaie, but only obligation to punishment: and others, who saie, our *Iustification, is the hiding of sin*, as Whitaker ad Rat. 8. Campian. But as sin, and punishment due to sin, are different: so the remitting of the punishment only, cannot be true remission of the sin. For where the guilt of sin remaineth, there is no true remission of sin: but in the

Protestants remission of sin, the guilt of sin remaineth, and men are truly sinners as they were before. Therefore in their doctrine, there is no true remission of sins, not anie true making of Not sinners, but only a remission of punishment due to sin.

7. And out of al thes foresaid Confessions of manie and the learnedest Protestants, we have, first, that
1. there is saving faith in the Roman
 2. Church: secondly, that saving faith
 3. is substantially one: Thirdly, that Protestants saving faith is substantially different from the saving faith of the Roman Church, and consequently no true saving faith, but only pretended.
- And thus much out of learned Protestants confessions, that the Roman Church is a true Church, and that she hath true saving faith: Now let vs heare their like Confessions, that there is salvation in the Roman Church, both possible and secure; then the which, nothing more can be desired.

That manie, and the learnedest Protestants confes, that salvation maie be had in the Roman Church.

CHAPTER IX.

I. **T**Hat manie and the learnedest Protestants confes, that salvation maie be had in the Roman Church, is ewident by their former confessions, that she is a true Church, *c. 3. and 6.* and hath true saving faith. For where a true Church is, there are the keys *Chilling. c. 2. p. 119.* of the kingdom of heaven: and where *The visible Church shal* true saving faith is, there is possibilitie *alwaies propose so much* (at least) of salvation, so far as concerneth faith. But besids, they expressly *as is sufficiēt* confes it, both of our Catholik fore- *to bring men* fathers, who died in the Roman *to heaven.* Church before the Protestants Reformation was, as c. 3. before we saw, and also of others, who have died in that Church since the said Reformation.

Doubtles
manie saued
in Poperie.

C. 6.

See Chapter
3. 6.

Manie
saued.

Luther (as we cited c. 3.) saith , that the Roman Church hath the verie kernel of Christianitie , and al that Christianitie ought to have , and that doubtles manie were saved vnder Poperie in the faith therof. Calvin contra Libertinos c. 4. saith, that the Pope leaveth hope of salvation. King Iames in his speech to the Parliament 1603. we confes , that manie Papists (especially our Ancestors) putting their only hope in Christ and his merits, maie be saved, and often are saved, detesting in this parte, and iudging , worthe of fire, the crueltie of Puritans , who yeeld salvation to no Papist. Covel: we affirme , that thos, that live and die in that Church (of Rome) maie notwithstanding be saved. Whitaker. Among them (Papists) is a certaine ministerie, and some preaching of the word , which (without doubt) availeth manie to salvation. Morton. Some dying in the Church of Rome , for their beleif in Christ , maie be in state of life. White : I never denied, the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God , in which our Ancestors held true faith, and were saued. Prideaux.

*This salvation, which with great danger
maie be expected among thes filths, is not
to be attributed to their additions, but to
the foundation, which they hold common
with vs. White in defence of his waie
c. 37. The visible Churches of Greece,
Ethiopie, Armenia, and Rome, haue in
them the true Church of God, wherein men
may be saued. Potter. we cut not the
Church of Rome from the Bodie of Christ,
and the hope of saluation. Which Chil-
lingwoth repeateth and defendeth c.
7. p. 401. And the same Chillingworth
c. 1. p. 42. Though D. Potter do not take
it il, that you beleve yourselues maie be
sued in your Religion, yet he maie con-
demn you for affirming, that none can
be saved out it. And the like he hath of
Potters confession, p. 8. And c. 7. p.
401. cit. we approve thos fundamētal and
simply necessarie truths, which you retaine,
by which, some good soules among you maie
be saved. L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 35. p. 281.
From the beginning, manie learned men
granted this, that men maie be saved
in the Roman faith; and in the Margin
citeth Luther, Calvin, Hal, Abbots,*

*Saluation
in Rom.
Religion.*

Hooker, Feild, Mornay, Prideaux.
 And Ibid p. 285. *Manie Protestants indeed confes, there is salvation possible to be attained in the Roman Church. Ib. we and our adversaries consent, that there is salvation to some in the Roman Church. p. 282. The possibilitie of salvation (in the Roman Church) I think cannot be denied. sec. 38. p. 338. That the ladie might be saved in the Roman faith or Church, I confes. Ib. p. 325. To beleve the Scripture, and the creeds, to beleve thes in the sense of the ancient primitiue Church, to receaue the fowr General Councels, to beleve al points of doctrin receaued as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a faith, in which to live and die, cannot but give salvation. The like hath Potter sec. 1. p. 7. And surely the Roman Church beleveth al this. Morton in his Appeale l. 4. c. 1. sec. 5. Answering to the confessions of divers Protestants who grant salvation to Papists, faith: They, not daring to close the armes of Christ, which were stretched out upon the Cros, to imbrace al, that without blindnes of error in points of faith, or purpos of continuance in anie*

*Cannot be
denied.*

*Salvation
in the Ro.
faith.*

to be in the Ro. Church. C. 9. 105

known sin, shal with Thomas touch by
faith the print of his sides, and have their
conscience died in his pretious blood, have
conceaved, as they ought (saith he) a sal-
vation for such, not only in the Roman,
but in other erroneous Churches. And
(as before we cited c. 3. Papists preach
the Ghospel, which is the power of God to
salvation. And in his Imposture c. 15.
sec. 27. granteth even *safetie* to be in
the Roman Church, as we shal see
hereafter.

Prot. ought
to conceave
salvation
in the Ro.
Church.

2. Thus plainly do thes Protestants
confes, that there is possibilitie of sal-
vation in the Roman Church, Rom.
faith, and religion, and that this pos-
sibilitie cannot be denied, that manie
Papists, and often, are saved: out of
which it followeth evidently, that
there is no possibilitie of salvation in
the Protestant Church or religion:
becaus the Roman and Protestant waie
of savation are substantially different,
naie quite opposit. For the Protestants
waie, is by Catholik faith and good
works. Besids, that thes religions dif-
fer in manie fundamental points of

6. 5. faith, as Protestants before confessed.
And there are not manie possible
waies of salvation substantially diffe-
rent or opposit.

*That divers Protestants confes, that
there is securitie of salvation,
or safetie, in the Roman
Church.*

CHAPTER X.

I. **M**ANIE Protestants confes
(as we saw in the former
Chapter) that there is possibilitie of
salvation in the Roman Church, thin-
king that thereby they do not much
advantage that Church, or preiudice
their own: becaus notwithstanding this
grant of possibilitie of salvation, they
hope sufficiently to with hold people
from entring into the Roman Church,
by adding, that notwithstanding the
possibilitie of salvation in the Roman
Church, there is no securitie of salva-

tion or safetie there, but great peril and danger of damnation. And nevertheless, such is the force of truth, that it breaketh out of their mouthes, and maketh them both directly and indirectly to grant, that there is even safetie in the Roman Church, though this L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 36. p. 302. denieth in thes words :

Al Protestants *Protestantes*
vnanimously agree in this, that there is *denie, they*
great peril of damnation for anie man to *grāt safetie*
live and die in the Roman perswasion, and *in the Rom.*
you are not able to produce anie Protestant, *Church.*
that ever said the contrarie. But, if I be
not much deceaued, both himself and
others saie, there is no peril of damna-
tion for to live and die in the Roman
religion : becaus both himself and
others saie, it is safe for some to live
and die in that religion : and safetie
cannot be, where there is great peril.
For thus he sec. 35. p. 285. we and our
adversaries consent, that there is salva-
tion to some in the Roman Church. we haue
not so learned Christ, as to denie salva-
tion to some ignorant siltie soules, whos
humble peaceable obedience makes them

Ignorants
safetie in
the Rom.
Church.

Ordinarie
men safe
where the
foundation
is held.

yea safest.

safe (note) among anie parte of men, who
profes the foundation Christ. Behold
Ignorant sillie soules safe in the Roman
Church. For the sillie Ignorant soules
in the Roman Church, are thos, of
whom he speaketh: and also becaus
he granteth, the Roman Church to
hold the foundation, Christ, as he pro-
fesseth ib. p. 299. and sec. 36. p. 314.
where the foundation is but held, there for
ordinarie men, it is not the vivacie of
understanding, but the simplicitie of bele-
ving, that makes them safe. And as it is
the simplicitie of beleving, that makes the
safe, yea safest, so it is some times a quicknes
of understanding, that makes men take
up an unsafe waie about the faith. Behold
ordinarie men safe, yea safest, in the
Roman Church. For in her, the foun-
dation is held, as he confessed p. 299.
and besids, it is the Roman Church,
of which there he speaketh. And p. 316.
speaking of salvation in the Roman
Church, he saith: that manie poore
Christian soules, that have been, and are
mised in thes and other distracted times
of the Church of Christ, retaining an in-

ternal communion with the whole visible Church of Christ in the fundamētal points of faith, and performāce of acts of charitie, are by Gods mercie safe in the midst of thos waves, in which their Misleaderſ perish.

Behold againe, manie poore Christian ſoules, and ordinariemen, are safe in the Roman Church, and there is no peril of damnation for such in her. For who are safe, are out of danger. Chillingworth also lib. cit. c. 7. p. 404. D Potter

hath told you plainly, to what men your religion maie be safe, and your errors not damnable, to such, whom ignorance maie

*Rom. religio
safe to the
Ignorants.*

excuse. And c. 4. p. 220. Maie it please you to take notice, that by Fundamental, we meane al, and only that, which is necessarie, and then I hope you wil grant,

*The like he
hath p. 8.*

that we maie safely (note) expect salvation in a Church, which hath al things fundamental to salvation? And (as we shewed c. 6.) he confesseth, that the Church of Rome holdeth al the fundamen-

*Safetie,
where the
fundamen-
tals are
held.*

mentals. Morton in his Imposture

c. 11. sec. 27. Nether do Protestants yeeld more safetie to the members of the Church of Rome in such a case, then they do to

*Safetie to
the members
of the Chur.
of Rome.*

¶ 10. *Prot. confes safetie*
whosoever heretiks, whos beleif doth not
undermine the fundamental doctrin of
faith. Behold safetie granted to igno-
rants, and to a Church, which hath al
things fundamental to salvation, and
vndermineth not the fundamētal doc-
trin of faith: as commonly Prote-
stants confes, the Church of Rome
doth not.

Aug. 26.

2. D. Potter lib. cit. sec. 3. p. 78.
To that demaund of Romanists: If we be-
leve their religion to be a safe waie to
heaven, why do we not follow it? we
answer: we beleve it safe, that is, by Gods
mercie not damnable to some, such as be-
leve what they profes. But we beleve it
not safe, but verie dangerous, if not
certainely damnable to such, as profes it,
when they beleve (or if their hearts were
upright, and not perversly obstinat) might
beleve the contrarie Behold, the Ro-
man religion a safe waie to heaven for
such, as beleve, what they profes, and
are not perversly obstinat. And cer-
tainely such, al true Romanists are:
For al true Ramanists beleve what
they profes, and are not perversly ob-

Rom religio
safe to such
as beleve it.

in the Roman Church. C.

stinat, but rationally constant in their
beleif. Befids it is plaine contradiction
to grant as Protestants doe that the
Roma Church is the Church of God,
the tabernacle of God, a Spouse of
Christ, and which hath the kernel of
Christianitie and al Christian good,
and to denie there is safetie in her.
For where shal safetie be, if not in
the Church of God, in the tabernacle
of God, in the Spouse of Christ and
where is the kernel of Christianitie,
and al pretended good? Moreouer if
pretended errors in points not funda-
mental in the Roman Church, would
hinder safetie in her, there could be
no safetie in anie Protestants Church,
becaus they grant, that none of their
Churches is void of errors, in such
points: and to say that errors in such
not fundamental points as Protestants
Churches err in, may stand with safe-
tie, but not errors in such not funda-
mental points as the Roman Church
erreth in, is to saie we wil put safe-
tie with what not fundamental er-
rors we please.

3. Secondly, Protestants confes, that the supposed errors of the Roman Church are not dānable, or pernicious to such, as beleve them. For first they teach, that errors against Not fundamental points, are no heresies, or no damnable heresies. Chilling. lib. cit. c. 4. p. 209. *There are no damnable heresies, but such, as are plainly repugnant to the prime verities.* Whitaker contro. 2.

No heresie
damnable
but against
the founda-
tion.

Q. 5. c. 18. *If an heretik must be excluded from sāvation, that is, becaus he overthroweth some foundation. For vnles he overthrow some foundation, he maie be saved.* L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 38. p. 355. *saith, that to err in things not absolutely*

No breach
of faith in
not funda-
mentals.

necessarie to sāvation, is no breach vpon the one sāving faith, which is necessarie.

p. 360. *In things not necessarie, though they be diuine truths also, Christian men maie differ, and yet preserve the one necessarie faith.* Potter sec. 2. p. 39. *Each discord in religion, dissolues not the vnitie of faith or charitie.* And commonly Protestants confes, that the errors of the Roman Church are not in fundamental, but only in not fundamental points.

points. And though errors in not fundamental points were in themselves damnable, yet Protestants confes, that the supposed errors of the Roman Church are not damnable to such, as beleve as they profes. For thus Potter fec. 3. p. 76. *Though in themselves, they be not damnable to them, which beleve as they profes, yet for us to profes, what we beleve not, were, without question, damnable.* Where he doth not saie only vpon supposition, that though our errors were not damnable to such as beleve them, yet it were damnable for Protestants, who beleve them not, to profes them, (as Chillingworth expoundeth him c. 7. p. 402.) For then he would have said, *Though your errors were not damnable: not (as he hath said) Though they be not damnable.* And besids in the words following, he plainly expresth him self, that he meaneth, that indeed they are not damnable. For he addeth: *And they with their errors, by the grace of God, might go to heauen, when we for our hipocrisie and dissimulation, without re-*

*Rom. errors
not damna-
ble.*

pentance, should certainly, be condemned to hel. Behold, he absolutely saith, that Papists, who beleve their errors, might goe to heaven: which they might not do, if they were in themselves damnable to such, as beleve them. And in the same page, speaking of the same errors, he saith: *To him, who in simplicitie of heart, beleves and practiceth them, and withal feareth God, and worketh righ-*

But venial. teousnes: to him, they shal prove venial, such a one shal by the mercie of God, ether be delivered from them, or saved with them. Is not this plainly to saie, that the supposed errors of the Church of Rome, shal prove venial, and such, as they, who in simplicitie of heart beleve and practice them, shal be saved with them? And are such, as shal prove venial and compatible with salvation, damnable in themselves? Chillingworth also c. 3. p. 163. And thes errors (of Rome) though to them that beleve them, we hope they wil not be

Not pernicious to the belevers.

pernitious, yet the professing of them against conscience, could not but bring vs to certaine damnation Behold againe, the

Roman errors wil not prove pernicious to them that beleve them. And if they wil not prove pernicious to such as beleve them, thes are in safetie, and out of danger of damnation by them.

4. But admit, that Roman errors were of themselves damnable and pernicious, yet Protestants confes, that Catholiks are out of danger of damnation by them, and so in safetie and securitie of salvation, notwithstanding their errors, becaus they have an antidote against al errors in them, who in simplicitie of heart follow them. For thus Chillingworth c. 3. cit. p. 163. *we from Scripture collect our hope, that the truths she (Roman Church) retaines, Papists have and the practice of them, maie prove an antidotes against al sins and errors. she mainteines, in such persons, as in simplicitie of heart follow this Absolon- These points of Christianitie, which have in them the nature of Antidotes against the poison of al sins and errors, the Church of Rome, though otherwise much corrupted, stil retaines. Behold the Church of Rome holdeth thos points of Chri-*

The like p. 7. he citeth out of Past.

*Chilling. p.
159. The
most mali-
gnant poison
will not poi-
son him that
receives a
more power-
ful antido-
te.*

stianitie, which have in them the nature of antidotes against al poison of errors : how then can she be in danger of damnation by errors , how not in safetie ? Besids c. 1. p. 40. he saith : *They only err damnably , who oppose what they know God hath testified.* And c. 3. p. 135. *without anie the lest dishonor to Gods veracitie , I maie doubt of, or denie some truth revealed by him , if I nether know nor beleve it to be revealed by him.* And surely the Romanists do not oppose anie thing, which they know or beleve God hath revealed. Therefore they err not damnably , nor dishonour Gods veracitie.

1. Thus we see , that Protestants confes , first, that *sillie ignorant soules, poore Christian men , ordinarie men ,* are safe in the Roman Church and Religion.
2. Secondly, that the Roman Religion is a safe waie to heauen for al thos , that *beleve as they profes with an upright heart , and are not perversly obstinat.*
3. Thirdly , that the supposed errors of Rome are not damnable, are not pernicious , to such, as in *simplicitie*

of heart beleve them, but to such wil prove venial, and with which they shal be saved.

Fourthly, and though they were in themselves damnable, *The Roman Church hath antidotes against al their poison, in al such persons, as in simplicitie of heart follow them.* So that, al Romanists are secured from damnation for matters of faith, if in simplicitie of heart they beleve what the Roman Church teacheth, which is as much, as anie true Romanist requireth. For we seek securitie of salvation only for such in the Roman Church, as in simplicitie of heart beleve what she teacheth. But if there be securitie for such in the Roman Church, there is no securitie in the Protestant Church: becaus (as is before proved) their waies C. 4. of salvation from sin, are fubbantially different: naie quite opposit; as by good works; not by good works: by Catholik faith, not by Catholik faith: by special faith, not by special faith.

4.

*That of different or opposit faiths or
wayes of salvation , that is the
safer , which the Adversaries
therof confes , or of which both
dissenting parties agree.*

CHAPTER XL

I. **H**eretofore we have shewed,
that Protestants confes , that
the Roman Church is a true Church,
hath saving faith , and true waye of
salvation , yea safetie or securitie of
salvation: Now we wil prove , that in
all reason they ought to confes , it to
be a far safer waye to salvation , then
the Protestant waye. For surely of two
different and opposit wayes , that must
needs seeme safer , which manie and
learned adversaries of that waye , do
confes to be safe , then that , which no
adversaries confes to be good or safe,
but only thos , that follow it. For

which adversaries confes. C. 15. 179

whence should the confession of manie and learned adversaries, touching the the goodnes or safetie of the one waie proceed, and the not confession of anie adversaries, touching the goodnes of the other, but condemnation therof by al adversaries, but from the greater evidencie of truth in the one waie, then in the other? what should make adversaries of a truth confes it, especially when of their confession wil follow evidently the condemnation of their own doctrin, but the plaine vndeniable evidencie of that truth?

2. Nevertheles L. Laude lib. cit. sec. 35. p. 288. denieth, that *in points of faith* (as he speaketh) *or salvation, it is the safest for a man to take that waie, which the aduersaries cōfes, or the differing parties agree on, to be universally or necessarily true.* Which he proveth by reason and divers instances. His reason is, becaus the consent of disagreeing parties, is nether rule, nor proof of truth. For Herod and Pilat, disagreeing parties, agreed against truth it self.

See sup. c. 1.

But besides that this is contrarie to Scripture, Fathers, Reason, and testimonie of Protestants brought before, that confession of adversaries is a convincing argument against themselves, and that in matter of life, libertie, or goods, al reasonable men account it safer, on which the adversaries, or dissenting parties agree, here the question, is ether vnruly, or verie obscurely proposed by him. For if by *points of faith*, he meane such, both which are true points of faith (as it seemes by his instances he doth) he vnruly proposeth the question. For we speak not of different points of true faith, wherof both are true: but confess, that the agreement of adversaries about one such point, maketh it not safer then the other, they both being testified by God, though (as we shall see hereafter) their agreement about one such point, maie make vs to more firmly beleve it, then an other, about which they agree not. But we speak of different or opposit saving faiths or religions, as are the Roman and

*The questio
is of points
of opposit
faithes.*

which adversaries confes: C. II. 127

Protestants saving faith and religion, both which cannot be true or safe, but the one of them only truely safe, and the other, but pretended or imagined to be true or safe; and saie, that of such different saving faiths, or waies of salvation, that is the safer, on which the dissenting parties agree, or the adversaries therof confes. And against this no one of his instances proceedeth. For ether they are not in opposite points, both which cannot be true, or where there is not the confession of adversaries, or agreement of dissenting parties. To his reason I answer, that the confession of adversaries, or agreement of dissenting parties, is not a rule of truth, but is a proof of truth. *See sup. c. i.* To his example of Herod and Pilat, I saie, it not to the purpos. For they were adversaries for temporal matters, not for Christ: nether did both of them consent, that he was the Messias, and yet one of them would suppress him; as Catholiks and Protestants are adversaries for the Roman religion, and both of them consent it to

122 C. II. *That is the safer may*
be good, and yet Protestants would
suppres it.

*Catholiks
allowed the
baptisme of
Donat. but
not their
giving it.*

3. His first instance, is in the Ba-
ptisme of Donatists, which both Ca-
tholiks and Donatists agreed to be
true, and yet was it not safer then Ba-
ptisme of Catholiks, which Donatists
denied to be true. I answer, that if he
meane of the Baptisme it self, which
Catholiks and Donatists gave, the
instance is dislike for matter. For the
baptisme of Catholiks and Donatists
was one and the same in substance, and
so both true, nor could the one be
safer then the other: wheras different
religions are different things, and in-
compatible, so as one only of them
can be truly safe, and which that is, we
gather by the consent of them who
are adversaries to it. But if he meane
of the Catholiks and Donatists giving
baptisme, the matter is like. For one
only of thes could be lawful. But then
the instance is dislike for want of con-
sent of adversaries: becaus the Catho-
liks did not allow the Donatists giving
of baptisme to be lawful, nor the

Donatists the giving of it by Catholics.

4. His second instance, is in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in which Calvinists beleve Christ to be present in vertue and efficacie, which Catholics also confes, and yet grant not, that Christs presence in the Eucharist in vertue and efficacie, is safer then his presence there in substance. I answer, that here is the like fault, for want either of like matter, or of consent of adversaries. For that presence of Christ in the Eucharist in vertue and efficacie, which Catholics approve, is nowaie opposit or incompatible with his presence in substance, as the truth of one religion is incompatible with the truth of anie other. And so meaning of such presence in vertue, as Catholics confes, and is compatible with presence in substance, the instance is vnlike for matter: But if he meane of presence of Christ in the Eucharist only in vertue and efficacie, which is indeed that presence, which Calvinists teach, the instance is vnlike for want of consent

*Cath. allow
not mere
presence in
vertue.*

of adversaries. For Catholiks neuer approve such presence of Christ in the Eucharist. What L. Laude addeth, that Protestants beleveth the *true and real presence of Christ in the Sacrament*, I omit, as not to this matter: sure I am, that Beza

Cont. Hel-
sus: p. 292.
297.

and others profes, that *Christs bodie is as far from the bread and wine, as the highest heaven is from earth.*

5. His third instance (which p. 303. he calleth his first) becaus there he beginneth anew count, is of Christs descent into hel. For both Catholiks and Protestants agree, that *Hel* in the creed signifieth the place of the damned, and yet Catholiks count it not safer, to grant Christs descent into the place of the damned, then only into the Limb of the Fathers. This instance is not to the purpos for divers causes. First, becaus it is not in a point of faith, in which kinde he vndertook to bring instances. For it is no point of faith with Catholiks, that Christ did not descend into the place of the damned: and Bellarmin l. 4. de Christo c. 16. held it more probable, that he

descended into the place of the damned: Secondly, because the matter is unlike. For Christs descent into the place of the damned, and into the Limb of the Fathers, are not opposit or incompatible to be both true, as different religions are. Thirdly, this instance is unlike for want of consent of adversaries. For thos Catholiks, who denie Christs descent into the place of the damned, denie, that *Hel* in the creed doth signifie the place of the damned. Whereas Protestants confes, that self same Roman Religion to be safe, which they condemn. I omit, that Montacute parte poster:

Originum p. 440. confesseth, that some of the English Church denie Christs descent into Hel, and nameth Perkins, and Willet: And Moulins de fugis Arnoldi p. 49. saith *we beleve not a local descent of Christs soule into hel.* *Prot. denie a local descent of Christ into Hel. see Carli of that matter.*

6. His fourth instance (which p. 303. he calleth his second) is of communion in both kinds. For Catholiks and Protestants consent, that Christ instituted it, and the Primitiue Church

also vsed it, in both kinds, and yet Catholiks wil not grant, that it is safer to vse it in both kinds, then in one. But nether is this instance to the purpos. For albeir Catholiks agree with Protestants, that Christ instituted, and the Primitiue Church vsed Communion in both kinds: yet they agree not, that ether Christ, or the Primitiue Church cōmaunded it in both kinds. And there being no Commaundement, ether of Christ, or of the Primitiue Church, to communicate in both kinds, and a forbiddance therof by the present Church, they iustly think it safer, to communicate in one kindethen in both. So this instance is not to the purpos, for the want of the aduersaries approving that, which is in question. For Catholiks grant not to Protestants, that ether Christ, or the Primitiue Church commaunded communion in both kinds: nor that Communion in both kinds now, (after the forbiddance of the Church) is safe, and yet impugne it, as Protestants allow the Roman Religion,

which adversaries confes. C. II. 127
and yet impugne it.

7. His fifth instance (which p. 305. he calleth his third) is the Celebration of the Eucharist, which Catholiks and Protestants agree to be a commemorative Sacrifice, and yet Catholiks account not that safer, then to beleve it to be a real or proper Sacrifice. Nether is this to the purpos, for want, ether of like matter, or of consent of Adversaries. For a commemorative sacrifice, and a proper sacrifice, are no more opposit or incompatible, then in the old law, a figurative and proper sacrifice, were opposit: And Catholiks as they grant the sacrifices of the old law, to be both sacrifices, figurative of Christs Passion to come, and withal proper sacrifices offered then to God: so they grant the celebration of the Eucharist, to be a sacrifice commemorative of Christs Passion now past, and withal a true sacrifice offered to God. But a mere commemorative sacrifice, is indeed incompatible with a proper sacrifice: But Catholiks agree not with Protestants, that the

*Cath. allow
not a mere
commemo-
rative sa-
crifice.*

228 C. 11. *That is the safer may*
celebration of the Eucharist, is a mere
commemorative sacrifice. So Catho-
liks are not adversaries to that com-
memorative sacrifice which they grant:
nor grant that mere commemorative
sacrifice, to which they are adver-
saries: whereas Protestants approve that
Roman Religion, to which they are
adversaries.

8. His sixth instance (which p. 307.
he termeth his fourth) is of baptisme,
in which Catholiks and Protestants
agree, that the matter and forme
therof are necessarie; but disagree
about the necessitie of the intention
of the baptizer. And yet Catholiks
think not the necessitie of the matter
or forme, safer, then the necessitie
of the intention of the Baptizer. This
instance is faultie as the others. For it
is not in things opposit or incompa-
tible to be both true or safe, as diffe-
rent Religions are; nor in a thing
which is approved by both parties,
and yet impugned by one of them, as
the Roman religion is approved by
both Catholiks and Protestants, and
yet

which adversaries confes. C.II. 120
yet impugned by Protestants. The
necessitie of the matter and forme of
baptisme is not incompatible with the
necessitie of the intention of the Ba-
ptizer, so as they cannot be both true,
as different religions are, and cannot
be both true or safe. Nether do the
Catholiks here impugne anie thing,
which they grant to be true.

9. His seaventh instance (which p.
307. he calleth his fift) is of the Missal
and cōmunion book. For (as he saith)
some Preists have confessed, that the
Communion book hath no positive il,
and yet Catholiks wil not account it
safer, then the Missal. Nether is this
to the purpos. For howsoever some
Preists have confessed, that the Com-
munion book conteineth no positive
il, none ever confessed, that it cōteined
no privative il, that is, want of good
necessarie for a book of the publik
service of the Church: becaus it wan-
teth the Canon of the Masse, wherin
is true and proper sacrifice, which is
the soule and life of Gods publik ser-
vice. So this instance wanteth the

*How the
communion
book, is il.*

130 C.11. *That is the safer may*
consent of adversaries to that, which
one partie impugneth.

10. After al the instances p. 308.
he bringeth others, *in which if anie*
dare saie, that it is safest to beleve, as
dissenting parties agree, or as the adverse
parties confesse, he dare saie, he shal be an
heretik in the highest degree, if not an
infidel. His first instance is in the Ca-
tholiks and Arians, who agreed, that
God the sonn was of like nature to his
Father, but disagreed about the iden-
titie of nature with his Father: and yet
likenes of nature, is not safer, then
identitie. This instance supposeth fals.
For the Catholiks did not agree with
the Arians, that God the sonn was of
like substāce to his Father, but vtterly
reiected ὁμοῦσιος. For likenes in sub-
stance, supposeth diversitie in sub-
stance, and is a relative opposition.
And vntrue it is, which he saith, *who*
confesses, he is of the same substance, con-
fesses he is of the like substance. And if
likenes and identitie of substance were
not incompatible (as he thinks they
are not) this instance were two waies

which adversaries confes. C.11. 131
from the purpos. First, becaus it is
not in things incompatible, as diffe-
rent Religions are. Secondly, for want
of agreement of adversaries. For Ca-
tholiks did not agree with Arians
about the likenes of Nature, and yet
impugned it, as Protestants agree
with Catholiks about the truth of the
Roman religion, and yet impugne
it.

II. His second instance p. 309. is of
Catholiks and old heretiks, who
agreed, that there is a resurrection of
the soule from sin, but disagreed
about the Resurrection of the bodie
from death. Nether is this instance to
the purpos, becaus the Resurrection
of the soule from sin, it not opposit or
incompatible with resurrection of the
bodie from death, so as they can be
both true, as different religions can
not. Nether did the Catholiks im-
pugne the Resurrection of the soule
from sin, in which they agreed with
thos old heretiks, as Protestants im-
pugne the same Roman religiō, which
they agree with Catholiks to be true.

12. His third instance, is of the Catholiks and Anti-Trinitarians, who agree there is a God, but disagree that there is à Trinitie of persons: And yet the vnitie of God, is not safer, then the Trinitie of persons. This instance is faultie as the former. For nether is it in things incōpatible. For the vnitie of God, and Trinitie of persons are not incompatible, so as they cannot both be true, as different religions: are nether did the Catholiks, who granted the vnitie to be safe, impugne it, as Protestants impugne the Roman religion, which they grant to be safe.

13. Like to this is his fourth instance p. 310. of Catholiks and old heretiks, who agreed, that Christ was man, but disagreed that he was God: and yet his manhood is not safer, then his Godhead. For Christs Godhead and manhood are not incompatible, so as they cannot both be true, as different religions are. Nether Catholiks, who agreed with old heretiks, that Christ was man, impugned nevertheles his Godhead, as Protestants, who agree

which adversaries confesse. C. II. 133
with Catholiks, that the Roman Religion is true, nevertheles impugne it.

14. But as for such points of faith, which are different but not opposit or incompatible, and so maie be both true (as different religions cannot) though consent of adversaries to one of them, doth not prove it to be safer, then the other, about which they dissent, in that sense in which we now take *safer*, when we enquire of differēt Religions, which is the safer. For now we take *safer* for that, which alone is truly safe, and the opposit, but apparently safe, becaus so it is in different religions, wheras different points of faith, maie both be truly safe. And therefore consent of adversaries about one of them, doth not prove, that, in which they consent to be safer, that is alone truly safe, and the other, in which they consent not, to be but apparently safe; Nevertheles, consent of adversaries maie make vs more firmly to assent to such a point of faith, in which they consent, then to

*How safer
is here
taken.*

*More firmly
believed,
which ad-
versaries
grant.*

an other, in which they consent not. Becaues consent of aduersaries addeth authoritie, and so increaseth the motiue of assent, and the greater the authoritie of the aduersaries is, the greater is the increase of our motiue to assent, and so our assent is stronger and firmer. And herevpon S. Augustin l. 1. de Baptism: c. 3. said, that one maie more strongly beleve baptisme to be true among the Donatists, then among the Catholiks, becaues both Catholiks and Donatists agreed, that there was true baptisme among them, but they both agreed not, that there was true baptisme among Catholiks. And so, one maie more strongly beleve the vnitie of God, then the Trinitie of persons: the manhood of Christ, then his Godhead: Christs presence in vertue in the Eucharist, then in substance: the celebration of the Eucharist to be a commemoratiue, then to be a proper sacrifice: that the matter and forme of baptisme are necessarie, then the intention of the baptizer: and so of al such different,

*Robustius
crediturus
est esse bap-
tismum in
parte Do-
nati, quod
ab utrisque
nostrum di-
citur, quam
Ec.*

which adversaries confes: C. II. 135
ut not incompatible points, becaus
ivers adversaries beleve thos, and
ot thes. And so should Protestants,
ho beleve both the Roman and Pro-
stants religion to be safe, more fir- *Protestanes*
ely beleve the Roman to be safe, *should more*
en they beleve the Protestant to be *firmly be-*
se; becaus, for this, they have the *lieve the Ro.*
uthoritie and assent of manie and *Religion.*
arned adversaries, but not for that.
ether is this to be an heretik in anie
egree, or an infidel. For it is nether
eresie nor infidelitie, to beleve one
oint, more firmly then an other:
pecially when there is more autho-
ie for one, then for the other, as is the
thoritie of aduersaries: But it is here.
or infidelitie to denie anie point of
th, which they doe not, who be-
ve one more firmly then an other,
ving greater motiue to beleve one,
en the other, to wit, authoritie of
versaries for one, and not for the
her.

THAT OF DIFFERENT
or opposit saving faiths or reli-
gions, the safer is to be
chosen.

CHAPTER XII.

How safer
is here
taken.

In courses of
life, the safer
need not be
taken.

1. **T**Hat of different or opposit
faiths or religions, the safer
is to be chosen, is evident. For here
we take not *safer*; for *greater safetie*, in
comparison of les true safetie, but for
truly safe in comparison of only pre-
tendly safe. And the reason is, becaus
the Apostle testifying, and al agreeing,
(at least in words) that there is but
one saving faith, if it be once agreed,
that one certaine faith is true saving
faith, it is evident, that what faith is
different or opposit to it, is no true
saving faith, but only pretended. In
manners of life, becaus both are truly
safe, as to live married or vnmarrried,

Laical or Clerical, in Secular or Regular course of life, we are not bound in reason to take the safer waie: but it wil suffice, that we take a truely safe course. But in matter of faith, becaus there is but one true faith, reason bindeth vs to take the safer waie, becaus that alone is truly safe. And which is safer, we gather by the consent of adversaries.

See S. Augustin l.1. de baptis. c.3.5.

2. And herein we have the consent of Protestants. For thus L. Laude lib. cit. sec.35. p. 282. *Surely, if there be anie safer waie then an other, he is no wise man, that in a matter of so great moment, wil not he take himself to the safest waie.* And Chillingworth lib. cit. c.7. p.387.

Prot. grant that the safer waie in Religion is to be taken.

It is a truth, which, I presume, never was, nor ever wil be, by anie man in his right wits, ether denied or questioned, that everie man, in wisdom and charitie to himself, is to take the safest waie to his eternal salvation. And p.388. It is directly against charitie to ourselues, to adventure the omitting anie thing, that maie anie waie help, or conduce to our salvation, that maie make the waie to it

138 C. 12. *Of different waies*
more secure or les dangerous. And p. 395.
Never by anie man in his right wits was
denied, That men, in wisdom and cha-
ritie to themselves, are to take the safest
waie to eternal salvation. Which is true
(as I said) when there is but one waie
truly safe, as is in matter of faith or
religion. And ib. p. 395. *Men are bound*
for auoiding sin, alwaies, to take the safest
way.

3. And having hitherto proved,
that by the Confession of manie and
the learnedest Protestants, the Ro-
man Church is a true Church, tea-
cheth saving faith, and true waie to
salvation: and also by their Confes-
sions, that there is but one substantial
true Church, one substantial true faith,
and one substantial true waie of sal-
vation: and that the Roman Church,
Roman faith, and Roman waie of
salvation, is substantially different
from the Protestants Church, faith
and waie of salvation: and moreover,
that that Church, faith, and waie of
salvation, is safer, which the adver-
saries therof confes: and that the

to their Confession refuted. C. 13. 139
safer waie is to be chosen before the
vnfaier: Now let vs see, what learned
Protestants answer to this argument
of Catholiks, taken from the foresaid
Confessions of Protestants, both for
confirmation of the Roman Church,
faith, and waie of salvation, and also
for the condemnation of the Prote-
stant Church, faith, and waie of sal-
vation.

*Protestants answers to the Catholiks
argument taken from their
foresaid confessions,
Refuted.*

CHAPTER XIII.

I. **P**rotestants seek manie waies,
how to avoid the force of the
Catholiks argument, taken out of
their foresaid confessions, both for
the truth of their Church and reli-
gion, and also for the falshood of the

Protestants: becaus they can finde no one waie, that can satisfie. The first is, that which L. Laude giveth lib. cit. sec. 35. p. 288. *That though manie learned Protestants grant this (that there is salvation to be had in the Roman Church) yet al do not.* But no marvel, if al Protestants agree not in this positive point. For they agree al in no one positive point. Secondly, himself confesseth, that thos who denie it, do it vpon Churlishnes and malice. For thus he addeth. p. cited. *There are some Protestants, who as Churlishly denie them salvation, as they do vs.* And p. 285. *would you have vs as malicious, or at least as rash, as yourselues are to vs, and denie you so much as possibilitie of salvation?* And K. Iames in his speech to the Parliament 1605. iugded them *worthie to be burnt, who denied salvation to anie Papist.* And they, who are worthie to be burnt, and denie salvation to Papists vpon churlishnes and malice, are not to be regarded. Thirdly, it sufficeth vs, that (as he confesseth) manie learned Protestants, and even from the

*Protestants
denie chur-
lishly or
maliciously*

to their confessions, refuted. C.13. 141
beginning of Protestancie, as he addeth
p. 281. have confessed, that salvation
maie be found in the Roman Church.
For this seemed an evident truth to
them. I ad also, that (as we shal see
forthwith) other Protestants confes,
that *the learned Protestants do grant*
this : and that , in iudgment of al learned *Al learned*
men , and al Reformed Churches , there *Protestants*
is a true Church in Poperie. *al reformed* *Churches.* And that
Moises, when he argued out of the
confession of enemies, did not assume,
that al enemies confessed his God.
We shewed before c. 1. and 2. that the
confession of manie and learned Pro-
testants of the truth of the Roman
Church, faith, and waie of salvation,
is a convincent argument against such
of them, as grant it, and ought to be
also a forcible argumēt also to others
of their brethren, who denie it, espe-
cially, seeing the denial of this pro-
cedeth but of churlishnes, malice, and
rashnes, as L. Laude truly confesseth,
which kinde of denial, is no rational
denial, and so, nether it, nor the
deniers to be regarded of rational

*See Chil-
ling. c. 7.
p. 397.*

*The Church
of God.*

men, but to be accounted as none at
al. Besides, thos Protestants, who denie
the Roman Church, faith, and salva-
tion, to be true, fall into such great
absurdities, as it forceth others to
grant them to be true. For it is not for
love to the Roman Church, or faith,
that anie Protestants grant them to be
true, but to avoid atheistical impieties,
which follow vpon the denial ther-
of. Morton in his Appeal l. 4. c. 2.
After he had related the confessions
of Protestants, that the *Learned*
writers do acknowledg the Church of Rome
to be the Church of God: that in the iudg-
ment of al learned men and al Reformed
Churches; there is in Poperie a true
Church, a true Christ: that thos, that
live and die in that Church, maie not-
withstanding be saved; Nether denieth,
that the learned Protestants confes
the Church of Rome to be the Church
of God, nor that al learned Protestants,
and al Reformed Churches confes
there is a true Church in Poperie: nor that
this is true: but answereth, that thos
same Protestants iudge the doctrin

to their confessions refuted. C. 13. 143
and worship of the Church of Rome
to be Anti-Christian and Idolatrous:
And yet conceived as they ought (saith
he) *salvation for some in the Roman* Salvation
with Anti-
Christian
and Idola-
trous doc-
trin and
worship.
Church, but did give no more advantage
by their said confessions to the Roman
Church, then they doe to erroneous Chur-
ches, which overthrow not the founda-
tion. And in his Imposture c. 15. sec.
27. saith, that Protestants, by grant-
ing, that salvation maie be in the Ro-
man Church, yeeld no more safetie to
the members of that Church, then to what-
soever heretiks, who do not undermine
the fundamental doctrin of faith. This
answer supposeth, first that the Roman
Church doth not undermine the fun-
damental doctrin of faith: and yet,
that her doctrin and worship is Anti-
Christian and Idolatrous: so that
Anti-Christianitie and Idolatrie, are what found-
ation of
Christiani-
tie Mor.
maketh.
not against the foundation of Chris-
tianitie: What foundation of Chris-
tianitie doth this man make, who
saith Anti-Christianitie and Idolatrie
are not opposit to it? Secondly, it sup- 2.
And saith
wilful sin-
ners,
poseth, that heretiks, who oppose not

the fundamental doctrine of Christ, and that they be saved: as that heretiks were wilful sinners against faith, and that wilful sinners against faith were in state of salvation. What salvation makest thou of this man, who puts wilful sinners against faith, in state of saluation? Secondly, it supposeth, that the concessions of Protestants give true and full safetie to Papists, though not more, then to such heretiks as err not from the foundation. And what can we expect more, then safetie? What mad men were they, who went out, or remaine out of a Church, in which is safetie? But out of this grant of safetie made, we evince, that nether Protestants, nor anie heretiks whatsoever, can have anie true safetie, becaus their doctrine differeth substantially from ours: and there can be but one substantial faith. And albeit Protestants doe give safetie to some heretiks, yet they doe them great advantage against themselves: yet they can give them no true safetie, becaus no heretiks are capable of such safetie: nor can they
giue

to their tryall, and to
 giue them anie other
 to prove themselves
 Church; or in true fa-
 that they are Heretiks, they are
 Catholiks, and so, as the
 Catholik Church, in which
 there is true safetie. And
 anie Heretik whatsoever
 is to saie, black is white,
 light. But as for Papists,
 themselves acknowledge
 no Heretiks, but Catholiks,
 ing them commonly *Catholiks*
Roman Catholiks. And for
 to grant Catholiks to be
Church of God, is to grant
 alone, to be the true Church
 Christ, and al Churches
 or opposit to them, to be false
 ches. I ad also, that no
 grant Heretiks, that en-
 damentals, to be *the Church*
 (as Chillingworth saith lib. 1. c. 1.
 p. 263.) * *The Church*, signifi-
Catholik Church, or *the whole Church*
 Or (as L. Laude saith sec. 20. p. 12.)
The only true Church: And no Protestants

* Prot. grant more to Cath. then to anie Heretik.

*And also
more Pro-
testants.*

granteth such heretiks , to be the whole Church , or the only true Church. Nether do al learned Protestants , or al reformed Churches iudge , that in such heresie , is a true Church , a true Christ , as they al do iudge there is , in Poperie. Wherefore far more Protestants grant safetie to Papists , then to anie heretiks : and also they grant far more to Papists , then they do to anie heretiks. For the *Learned Protestants* grant Papists to be *the Church* : And no Protestant granteth anie heretiks to be *the Church*. And *al learned Protestants , and al Reformed Churches* grant , that there is a *true Church in Poperie*. And al learned Protestants , al Reformed Churches grant not , that there is a true Church in anie heresie. But how manie Protestants soever , and what safetie soever , they grant to heretiks , thes are incapable of anie true safetie , in that they are heretiks , but Papists in that , they are granted to be Catholiks , are capable of true safetie. And therefore the grant of safetie to them , is an

Grant of
safetie to
Heret is
grant of
fals safetie.

148 C. 13. *Protestants answers*
safetie to thos, whom they grant to be
heretiks, grant a fals and contradic-
torie safetie, becaus heretiks are ca-
pable of no other safetie. Protestants
grant safetie to such, as they grant to
be heretiks. Therefore they grant them
a fals and contradictorie safetie.

3. Thus we see, that nether denial,
that al Protestants grant salvation to
be in the Roman Church: nor denial,
that therein they grant anie more to the
Roman Church, then to anie heretical
Church which impugneth not the
foundation of Christianitie, doth anie
waie weaken the force of the Catho-
liks argument, taken from their said
Confessions. Wherefore other Protes-
tants finde no better waie to answer
this argument, then in deed and in
effect to denie, that Protestants con-
fes, that there is salvation in the Ro-
man Church. For though in words
they are ashamed to denie this, by
reason of the manifold and manifest
confessionstherof by Protestants: yet
in deed they denie it, saying that
when Protestants grant salvation in

the Roman Church, they meane by
Roman Church, only such, as are in-
vincibly ignorant of her supposed
errors. This answer is opposit to the
two former, becaus thos supposed,
that when Protestants saie: The Ro-
man Church is a true Church, hath
saving faith, and salvation, by *Roman*
Church, they meane more then the
invincible ignorants, and seek to
escape, by saying, that *some Protestants*
saie so, not al: or that therby is no more
advantage granted to Papists, then to al
heretiks, who oppose not the foundation of
Christianitie. But this answer admitteth
not that supposition, but in effect
denieth, that anie Protestant granteth
Church, saving faith, or salvation, to
the Roman Church, or to anie true
Romanists, so the best meanes they
finde, to answer the Catholiks argu-
ment, taken from their confession,
that the Roman Church, is a true
Church, hath saving faith, and salva-
tion, is to denie, that Protestants ever
made such a confession, which is mere
impudencie, and an evident signe of

Chilling. p.

282. 398.

400.

Potter sec. 3.

p. 46.

Canter p.

35. 283. 285.

Sup. c. 3.

a desperate cause. For who reading the former confessions of Protestants, can think, that by *Roman Church*, and manie others such names, they meant only such, as are invincibly ignorant of her supposed errors? Who is there, that vsing the name of *Roman Church*, and distinguishing it from Lutheran, Calvinist, and such other Churches, doth not include al kinds of Romanists, as wel the intelligent s, as the ignorant s? What other is this, then to make al the foresaid Protestants, Equivocators in matter of faith, not meaning such men, as al vse to meane by the *Roman Church*, and manie other such names at they vse and we related c. 3.

Sup. c. 3.

4. But that Protestants, when they saie, *The Roman Church, the Assemblie of Papists, Papists, the Papistical Church, the Latin Church subiect to Romish Tirannie*, is a true Church, hath saving faith, and salvation, do meane even of thos, whom they account to be vincibly ignorant of her errors, is evident. First, becaus the denie it merely, becaus they cannot

denie the sequel therof: That then
their Church is no true Church becaus
there is but one true Church. Secōdly,
becaus the same difficultie is in their
granting (as commonly they do)
That heretiks in not fundamental
points, are in the Church, have a
saving faith, and are in state of salva-
tion, for heretiks are vincibly errants.
Wherefore when they saie, The Ro-
man Church is a Church &c. they
should not exclude such Romanists,
as they account vincibly errants in not
fundamental points. Thirdly, becaus
(as Chillingworth saith c. 7. p. 399.
*By the Roman Church, to understand the
ignorant members of it, is a verie unusual
senecdoche; and much more unusual it
were to understand them only. And yet
(as the same Chillingworth saith c. 2.
p. 57.) Men should speak properly, where
they write of controversies in Religion.*
Fourthly, it is against their common
vaunting of greater charitie, then we
have. For if they grant not salvation
to such Papists, as they count vincibly
ignorant of Roman errors, but only

2.

Whitaker

cont. 2. q. 5.

c. 18.

Morton

Imposst. c. 15.

Field. l. 3. de

Eccl. c. 5.

L. Lauda

sec. 21.

3.

4.

*Protestanti-
bus credentes
may be sa-
ued, but not
Protestantes*

*l. de util.
cred.*

*Curst Dame
of R. is Ca-
tholik.*

*And the
Church of R.
from which
Protestants
separated.*

to such, as are invincibly ignorant of them, they have no more charitie then we. For we grant Church, saving faith, and salvation, to such Protestants, as are invincibly ignorant of their errors. But yet we never grant true Church, saving faith, or salvation, to the Protestant Church, or to anie formal Protestants. For such, as are invincibly ignorant of their errors, are no formal Protestantes, but rather, *Protestantibus credentes, quam Protestantes*, as S. Augultin distinguisheth of heretiks, and hereticis credentes. Besids Potter lib. cit. sec. 1. p. 11. confesseth, that Roman Church to be a member of the Catholik, which ib. and p. 10. he calleth the *Curst Dame of Rome*, who reveleth in the house of God, hath manie waies plaid the harlot, and deserved a Bil of divorce from Christians. And sec. 3. p. 74. 75. we acknowledge the Church of Rome a member of the bodie of Christ, and this cleares vs from seisme, whos propertie it is, to cut from the bodie of Christ and hope of salvation, that Church, from which it separates, But they

to their confessions, refuted. C.13. 153
separated themselves from the intelligent parte of the Roman Church. Therefore this parte, they must acknowledge a member of the bodie of Christ, and in hope of salvation.

5. But howsoever they maie equivocate in the name of the *Roman Church*, becaus that includeth persons both intelligent and ignorant, how can they equivocate in the name of *Poperie*, or *Roman Religion*, which is but one, and in which they saie men maie be saved, and withal profes to vnderstand by it, the doctrine of the Council of Trent, which is diametrically contrarie to Protestancie, and condemneth it of heresie? Is not this to saie, that men maie be saved in a waie directly opposit to Protestancie? That a waie directly opposit to Protestancie, is a true waie of saluation, and that there are two waies to saluation directly opposit, and one condemning the other? And to saie, that when by *Roman Religion*, they mean the doctrine of the Council of Trent, they meane only thos points, in which the

*Perkins in
initio Problem.*

*Chillingworth.
c.6, p.375.*

154 C.14. *Prot. confes that Luther*
Council of Trent and Protestants
agree, were ridiculous, becaus in the
same place, they profes to impugne
the Roman faith or religion : which
yet they impugne not in thos points in
which it agreeth with Protestancie, but
in thos points, in which it disagreeeth.
And thus much of Protestants con-
fession, that the Ro. Church is a true
Church.

That manie and Learned Protestants
confes, that Luther learnt the
chiefest points of their religion,
of the Diuel.

CHAPTER XIV.

I. **H**itherto we have related the
Protestants cōfessions of the
truth of the Romau Church, and of
saying faith, and salvation and safetie
in her, it should follow, that we should
also relate their like confessions of the

learnt his religion of the diuel. C. 14. 155
qualities or conditions of the Protestants Church and Religion, by which maie yet more clearly appeare the falsitie therof. becaus contraries, being put together, do more appeare: and so the truth of the Roman Church and religion should more appeare, by the apparent falsitie of the Protestants Church and religion: and that appeare the truer and safer, by how much this doth more appeare to be fals and desperate; yet becaus in the second Book of the Author of the Protestant religion, ten such qualities or conditions of the Protestant religion are proved by abundant and plaine confessions of al sorts of Protestants, to wit, First, that the substance of Protestant religion was perished before Luther arose: Secondly, that no man before him, beleved the substance of it. Thirdly, that is was altogether invisible. Fourthly, that before him, were no Protestant Ministers. Fifthly, that before him, it had no place to be in. Sixtly, that al the first known Protestants had been, til Luthers time,

Ten qualities of Prot. religion proved by their confessions.

156 C.14. *Prot. confes that Luther*
professed Papists. Scaventhly, that no
Ancienter Protestant adioined him-
self to Luther, when he preached Pro-
testancie securely. Eightly, that the
Protestant religion is new. Ninthly,
that Luther is by Protestants acknow-
ledged, in expresse termes, the Author,
and Founder of Protestant religion.
Tenthly, that they have no authen-
tical testimonie, nor yet other Argu-
ment to prove, that Protestant reli-
gion was before Luther, but that which
is a manifest sophisme. Al which qua-
lities and conditions of the Protestant
religion, being there evidently proved
by manifold and manifest confessions
of al sorts of learned Protestants, to wit,
Lutherans, Calvinists, and English
Protestants, and not yet answered by
anie Protestant writer, (though the
book hath been Extant both in Latin
and English aboue twentie yeares)
do plainly convince, that the Pro-
testant religion is no true religion
instituted by God, but a more impos-
ture of Luther. Yet to them al I wil
add one, which alone is sufficient to

learnt his religion of the Diuel. C. 14. 157
make anie reasonable man, careful of
his soule and saluation, to abhor and
detest it, to wit, that the cheifest
point of it, is the doctrin of the
Diuel.

2. For that the cheifest point of
Protestant religion is this: *That Masse* The distinc-
tive signe of
a Papist and
Protestant.
is Idolatrie, or naught, is evident. For it
is the distinctiue signe of Protestants
from Papists. For if anie goe to Masse, Caluin 4. c.
2. d. 9. Pra-
cipue cōmu-
nionis (Pa-
pistica) vin-
culum in
Missa est.
he is accounted a Papist: and if he goe
not, a Protestant. Now, that this cheif
and distinctiue point of Protestancie,
was taught to Luther by the Diuel, is
cōfessed by manie earnest and learned
Protestants. For thus Luther in his book
of private Masse tom. 6. Ienensi, fol.
81. as it is cited by by Hospinian par. 2.
Hist. Sacramentarij An 1533. fol. 131.
*Here I wil begin of myself, and make
some smal Confession. Once at midnight,
I awaked from sleep, and forthwith Satan* Luther was
awake.
began a dispute in my minde, as he wel
knowes how to make manie nights bitter
and sower enough to me. Doest thou heare The Diuel
(saith he) most excellent Doctor? Art objecteth.
thou ignorant, that thou hast said private

158 C.14. Prot. confes that Luther
Masses for fifteen yeares, almost everie
daie? And what if in the Masses, thou
hadst committed mere idolatrie, and hadst
thyself there adored, and proposed to others
to adore, not the bodie and blood of Christ,
but mere bread and wine? I answered thus:

Luther an-
swereth.

The Diuel
replieth.

Luther did
sweat.

But I am a Priest, consecrated to this
function, and had both Chrisme and con-
secration of a Bishop, and besids, did al
this by commaund of my superiors, and
dutie of obedience. How then did I not
consecrate, seeing I pronounced the words
with diligent care, and used al the devo-
tion I could in saying Masse? Thou saist
true in this, answered Satan. But Turks
and al Ethniks, whatsoever they do in
their Temples, are wont to do by cōmaund,
and careful devotion. He saying this, I
did sweate, and my heart began to tremble
and pant. The Diuel knowes how to fasten
strongly and urge his arguments, he useth
also a grave and strong voice. Nether are
thes kinds of disputations passed in long or
manie meditations, but in one moment
the question and the answer is ended. I felt
and wel experienced, how it sometimes
falleth out, that in the morning, men are

*earn't his religion of the Diuel. C. 14. 159
found dead in their beds. He can kil and
murther the bodie, and not that only, but
he can also so vrge the soule with his
disputes, and drive it into straits, that in
a moment it must depart, wherto he hath
al most brought me more then once.*

3. Hitherto are Luthers words,
related by Hospinian: But Luther in
his book de privata Missa to. 7. fol. 228.
goeth farther, and setteth down the
five argments which the Diuel made
for to perswade him, that Masse was
naught: which the Diuel first propo- *The Diuel*
seth singly, after vrgeth them altoge- *plaieth the*
ther, and confirmeth them by exam- *maister.*
ples, and proposeth some obiections
to himself, and answereth them: and
so plaieth perfectly the Master and
perswader. Now that he who here
disputeth with Luther, was the Diuel,
is evident: becaus Luther in the words
cited twise plainly called him *Satan,* *That is was*
and once *Diuel.* And he in his first ar- *the Diuel,*
gument proposeth himself to be one
of the *Reprobate spirits, that trust not in*
Christs mercie, nor hold him for a Savior
or Mediator, but feare him as a Cruel

Luther
plaieth the
schollar,

Judge. Secondly it is evident, that Luther in this conference behaved himself as a true schollar. diligently harkning to what the Diuel taught him, and proposing his doubts to him, and finally embracing his doctrine. Thirdly, that the Diuel carried himself like a true Master to Luther: first, by getting Luthers good wil to heare him, by flattering him calling him *most excellent Doctor*; and by proposing his Doctrine, first of al, in manner of a question, as he did to Eve: Next, by bringing manie and apparent reasons to prove it: then by illustrating them by examples: and lastly, by proposing difficulties, and answering them. Fourthly, that the doctrine which the Diuel here would chiefly teach Luther, was, that in privat Masse, was committed mere Idolatrie, which is the cheifest point of Protestancie. And so by the Confession of Luther, the cheifest point of Protestancie, is the doctrine, which the Diuel with so manie Arguments, and so great labour taught Luther.

That mass
is idolatrie,
is the doctrine
of the
Diuel.

learnt his religion of the Diuel. C. 14. 161

4. And this same confesseth Hospi-
nian loc. cit. For before his recital of
Luthers foresaid words, thus he writ-
teth: This yeare, did Luther publish a
book of private Masse, and consecration of
Preists: wherein streight from the begin-
ning, he describeth a conference had of him
with the Diuel, and confesseth, that therein
he was admonished by the Diuel of manie
abuses of Masse, especially private Masse.
And in the margin putteth this Note:
The conference of Luther with the Diuel,
of whom he is instructed of the errors of
the Masse. And after the recital of Lu-
thers foresaid words, saith: And the
rest, which there he reciteth much more of
this dispute: the summe wherof, is, that he
was, taught of the Diuel, that Masse,
especially private Masse, was a naughtie
thing: and that being convicted by the
Diuels reasons, had abolished it. And
fol. 26. Is he ignorant, what Luther
writeth, not of an Angel, but of the Diuel
himself, who by night had Conference
with him, and taught him of manie abuses
of Popish Masse. So that by the con-
fession of Hospinian, Luther was ad-

Luther ad-
monished of
the Diuel.

Instructed
of the Diuel.

Taught of
the Diuel.

Convinced by
the Diuels
reasons.

Taught of
the Diuel's

162 C. 14. *Prot. confes that Luther*
 monished and instructed by the Diuel
 of the errors and abuses of Masse: and
 that the summ of Luthers words of
 this his conference with the Diuel, is,
 that he was taught of the Diuel, that
 Masse, especially private, was naught:
 and that being convicted by the Di-
 vels reasons, he had abolished Masse.
 So that Luther was scholler to the
 Diuel, becaus he was admonished, in-
 structed, taught of the Diuel, and con-
 victed by the reasons of the Diuel. And
 the doctrin, which the Diuel taught
 Luther, and Luther learned of the
 Diuel, was, that Masse was naught.
 And least anie should suspect, that
 Hospinian confesseth this of il wil to
 Luther, he professeth thus in his
 Prolegominies to that historie: *I wil*
saie nothing fals or feigned for hatred of
Luther. For I acknowledg him to have
been a man adorned of God with manie
excellent gifts and vertues, with wit,
light of heavenlie doctrin, learning, elo-
quence, wisdom, zeal of Gods glorie, and
invincible courage of minde against al in-
vasions, and from heauen framed and

*what is to
 be a scholler
 of the Diuel*

*Hospinians
 esteeme of
 Luther.*

learnt his religion of the Diuel. C. 14. 163
stirred up to bring to libertie and light the
Church of Christ, horribly oppressed in the
latter times with the tirānie and darknes
of AntiChrist, and to destroe a great part
of the kingdom of Anti-Christ. And
besids, this Confession maketh ma-
inely against Hospinian himself, be-
caus he embraceth this doctrin of the
Diuel, that Masse is naught, no les
then Luther, and so he is this mediate
Scholler. And therefore he had great
cause to conceale it, and none at al to
feigne it.

5. An other learned Protestant,
who confesseth this, is David Pareus
l. 5. de Euchar. c. 7. in thes words: *But
let them (Lutherans) rather look to
themselves, and think, what Luther
rehearseth of his familiar Conferences* Luthers fa-
miliar con-
ference with
the Diuel.
*with the black spirit the Diuel, and what
he openly professeth to have been suggested
to him in thes things, of the Diuel. Let
them therefore refute that old song and ar-
gument of Papists: Luther (himself wit-
nessing) learnt reasons of the black spirit* Luther
learnt of
the Diuel.
*the Diuel, why privat Masse, and unc-
tion of Priests, should be condemned:*

And it can-
not be de-
nied.

166 C.14. Prot. confes that Luther
therfore Luthers doctrin of the condemna-
tion of Masse, is Diabolical. Here I saie
is the place. The Antecedent, they cannot
denie. For otherwise the Papists wil
obiect to them, Luthers long Legend of his
dispute had with the black spirit the Diuel,
which himself hath described. But streight
you shal heare the Lutherans crying out,
that here is the fallacie of accident. For
truth, is alwaies truth. Nether is become
fals, though it be spoken or suggested of the
Diuel. And addeth: Luther confesseth
of himself, that some thing was suggested
to him by the black spirit. In which words
1. I note, first, that Luther confesseth,
that he had familiar conferences with
2. the Diuel: Secondly, that it was the
true Diuel, which Pareus often ter-
meth, *The black spirit*. Thirdly, that
3. Luther confesseth, he learnt reasons
of the Diuel, why Masse is to be con-
demned: and that Luther confesseth,
the Diuel suggested something to
4. him. Fourthly, that what the Diuel
suggested, and Luther learnt of him,
was that Masse was to be condemned.
5. Fiftly, that it is so euident, that Luther

learnt his religion of the Diuel. C.14. 167
witnesseth of himself, that he learnt
reasons of the Diuel for to condemn
Masse, as it cannot be denied.

6. Morton also, the present super-
intendant of Durham, l. 2. Apolog.c.
14. defendeth, that Luther was not to
be blamed, for having Conference
with the Diuel: that it doth not follow,
that the Masse is good, because the
Diuel condemned it: that everie doc-
trin of the Diuel, is not to be accounted
Diabolical: and that everie argument
of the Diuel against Mass, containeth
high truth, which is to confesse, that
Masse to be naught, is the doctrine
which the Diuel taught, and that the
Diuels arguments convince that: and
Luther learnt this doctrine of the Diuel.
And in his Replie for defence of this
his Apologie p. 7. confesseth, that he
*called the doctrine, which Luther heard
preached of the Diuel, the doctrine, of the
Diuel, to wit, preached of the Diuel. So*
we have it plainly confessed, that the
doctrine, that Masse is naught, is the
doctrine of the Diuel. Nether wil that
exposition, to wit, *preached by the Diuel,*

*Mort. granteth it to be
doctrine of
the Diuel.*

*Doctrine
against
Mass, doc-
trin of the
Diuel.*

166 C. 14. *Prot. confes that Luther*
help. First, becaus he added it not in his
Apologie, where, if (as he confesseth)
he called it the doct̃rin of the Diuel ,
he called it so simply and absolutely.
For there this addition or explication
is not added. Secondly , becaus the
Doct̃rin of the Diuel , includeth more,
then *Doct̃rin preached by the Diuel*. For
it signifieth, that he is the author of it :
which the Apostle sufficiently in
sinuated, in giuing warning of Diuelish
doct̃rin , by calling it *the doct̃rin of*
Diuels. And the Fathers shew the
same , by not calling anie point of
Christianitie , the doct̃rin of Diuels,
though manie points therof haue
been confessed by the Diuel. Thirdly,
becaus the Diuel cannot preach anie
doct̃rin of Christ. For (as the Apostle
saith) *how shal they preach , vnles they*
be sent ? And the Diuel was neuer sent
to preach anie point of Christs doct̃rin:
but runneth of himself, as his follo-
wers do. Now if it be true (as the
Scripture saith) that in the word of two
or three, euerie thing standeth , this
ought to be accounted true, that Lu-

Doct̃rin of
the Diuel ,
is as of the
author
therof.

1. Timoth 4.

Rom, 10.

learnt his religion of the Diuel. C. 14. 167

ther was scholler to the Diuel, and that Masse is naught, is the doctrine which the Diuel taught Luther. Naie,

if in al law, the Confession of the person accused, be a sufficient conviction, Luther is sufficiently convicted, that he learnt this doctrine of

A matter of fact whether Luther learnt of the Diuel or no.

the Diuel, that Masse is naught. And this being a matter of fact, whither Luther did so or no, it need no other proof, then his own confession, and attestation of some of his brethren.

Ones own confession sufficient to condemn him.

7. And out of that we haue related of Luthers report of his dispute with the Diuel, and confession of other Protestants, we maie gather, with what face Feild l. 3. of the Church c. vlt. wrote, that it is a *deuillish slander*, That Luther learned of the Diuel that the Masse is impious and wicked: or ~~Vener~~ in his Reioinder p. 92. that this was a *tentation of Luther, not his instruction*; and that Luther was disputed against, not the Masse. For it is most euident, both by Luthers words, and the attestatiō of his foresaid brethren, that Lnther learnt of the Diuel, that

Synge.

168 C.14. *Prot. confes that Luther*
Masse was Impious, and that it was
an instruction of Luther, wherein he
was instructed, that the Masse was ido-
latric: and that it was Masse which was
disputed against.

8. And thus having proved by the
Confession of Luther, and the attes-
tation of Learned Protestants, that Lu-
ther learnt his doctrine, that Masse is
idolatrie, of the Diuel: Let vs now
shew by their Confessions also, that
when the Diuel taught this to Lu-
ther, Masse was highly honoured of
al the Christian world. For ther by
we maie clearely see, that it was not
only the doctrine, of the Diuel but
also Diuelish doctrine, contrarie to the
faith of al Christians at that time.

That Learned Protestants confes, that
Masse vvas highly honoured of
al the Christian vworld before
Luther began to
impugne it.

CHAPTER XV.

1. **T**hat Masse was honoured of
al the Christian world before
Luther impugned it, is manifest. For
thus Luther himself l. de Captiuitate
tom. 2. fol. 68. beginning to write
against the Masse, saith: *Almost nothing*
is this daie more receaued or beloued in the
Church, then that Masse is a good work
and sacrifice. I begin a hard matter, and
which perhaps is impossible to be over-
thrown, as which being confirmed by so
long vse of ages, and approued by consent
of al, is so setled, that almost al the face
of the Church must needs be changed, and
taken awaie. And fol. 72. Neither let

*Nothing
more rema-
ued in the
Church
then Masse.*

By the
whole
world.

Luther
alone aga-
inst Masse.

The whole
world.

Luther first
under hea-
uen oppugned
Maß.

The Casimi-
rians in Ad-
monit. c. 6. p.
211. Luther
some yeares
after he im-
pugned the

170 D. 15. Prot. confes high esteeme
it moue, that the whole world hath the
contrarie sense and vse. And ib. fol. 244.
in his epistle to his fellow Austmes,
who first of al put down Masse, for to
encourage them therin: How often did
my trembling heart shake, reprehending
obiected to me their strongest and only ar-
gument: art thou alone wise, do al other
err, were so manie ages blinde, what if
thou erreſt, and drawest so manie in to
error for to be damned eternally? And lib.
de abroganda Miſſa ib. fol. 247. Com-
monly (without doubt) it is most beleued,
that al men are holpen by Masses. For it
seemes incredible, that the whole world
was so forsaken of God. And as vlenberg
writeth Causa. 21. p. 740. Alberus,
Amsdorffius, and others write of Luther,
that he first of al vnder heauen, did op-
pugne that external Melchisedechical
Preisthood and sacrifice in the new Tes-
tament.

2. Hutterus, a Professor at Witten-
berg, l. de sacrificio Miſſatico, p. 377.
I willingly grant, that the Popish Idola-
trie, of which is the true Miſſatical sacri-
fice, hath invaded almost al the world,

especially the last thousand yeares. Philip-
 pus Nicolai in Commentariis de regno ^{Papacie, re-}
 Christi p. 22. Let the Christian readers ^{tained Pur-}
 keep this, that not only the Gretian Chur- ^{gatorie,}
 ches, but also the Russians, Georgians, ^{Masse carry-}
 Armenians, Indians, and Ethiopians, ^{ing about}
 who are Christians, do beleue the true and ^{the bread,}
 real presence of Christs bodie and blood, ^{&c.}
 whersoever the Eucharist is celebrated.
 And addeth p. 64. Thos of Cataia haue
 their Chappels, where they sacrifice with
 Popish rites and Masses.

3. The Academie of Wittenberg
 apud Hospin. parte 2. historix Sacra-
 ment, fol. 20. The pernicious and impious
 abuse of Masse, hath euerie where so pre- ^{Euerie}
 uailed, both with the Clergie and Laitie, ^{where.}
 that opinion so wholly settled cannot be
 pulled out of their minds, to wit, that
 Masse is a good work, wherewith God maie
 be appeased.

4. Calvin. 4. instit. c. 18. §. 18. This
 abhominatiō of Masse, profered in a golden
 cup, hath so made drunk al the kings of the ^{al kings}
 earth and peoples, from the highest to the ^{and people}
 lowest, that they beleued the prore and the ^{from the}
 pupp of their saluation, to consist in it alone. ^{highest to}
 the lowest.

172 C.15. Prot. confes high esteeme
Zuinglius de vera Relig. c. de Eucha-
ristia. *I beleue, none wil denie, but that
we al ran to Masse, as to a sacred Anchor.*
Hospinian lib. cit. fol. 25. *Al kings,
Princes, and people of the earth, for the
last six hundred yeares, were so made
drunk with Masse, as with an infected
cup, that they placed the prore and pupp
of their salvation in it alone. And the
like saieth Lobechius disput. 26. p.
598.*

5. What now more cleare, then that
by the Confession of Luther, Luthe-
rans, and Calvinists, Masse was highly
esteemed of al Christians before Lu-
ther began to impugne it, he being
taught and incited therto by the
Diuel? And let anie Christian heart
iudg, what that is, which al Christians
then so highly honoured, and only
the Diuel impugned: and whether it
be not safer to follow al the Christian
world of that time, then the Diuel?
And hauing hertofore shewed, that
both Luther and learned Protestants
confes, that he was taught and con-
uined of the Diuel, that Masse was

naught, now let vs proue, that this doctrin, is the doctrin of the Diuel, and Diuelish doctrin.

That Protestants doctrin, that Masse is idolatrie or naught, is the doctrin of the Diuel proued by their former Confessions.

CHAPTER XVI.

1. **T**Hat the principal parte of the Protestant religion, to wit, that Masse is naught or idolatrie, is the doctrin of the Diuel, is euident by the former confessions of Protestants, For first Morton plainely confesseth, that he called it *the doctrin of the Diuel*. Nether wil it help him, that the called it so, becaus it was preached of the Diuel. For stil it is true, that it is the doctrin of the Diuel, and consequently one of thos doctrins, wherof S. Paul 1. Tim. 4. foretold vs, saying:

- In the latter dayes, some shal depart from faith, harkning to spirits of errors and doctrins of Diuels.* Secondly, becaus it is euident by Luthers relation, that the doctrin which the Diuel taught him, was that *private Masses are horrible Idolatrie.* And he proued that, with fūe arguments, and endeouored with al his force to perswade it to Luther. Thirdly, becaus Hospinian confesseth, that Luther was *admonished of the Diuel*

The Denils instruction is the Denils doctrin.

of manie abuses of Masse, instructed of the errors of Masse, that he was taught of the Diuel and conuicted by his reasons, that Masse was naught, taught of manie abuses of Popish Masse. And likewise Pareus confesseth, that it cannot be denied, that Luther learnt reasons of the Diuel, why Masse should be condemned. So that, *That Masse was naught, was the Diuels admonition, the Diuels teaching.* And is not the Diuels admonition, instruction, conuiction, teaching, the Diuels doctrin?

2. Perhaps some wil grant (as Morton hath done) that, *That Masse is idolatrie or naught, is the Diuels doctrin*

in so much as it was taught to Luther by the Diuel, as Christs doctrine maie be said to be that mans doctrine, who teacheth it, but not simply the Diuels doctrine, as if he were author of this doctrine. But this is easily refuted. First, because the Diuel, being an author of bad doctrine, as God is author of good, what is said to be the Diuels doctrine, is said to be his doctrine as author of it, as what is said to be Christs doctrine, is meant to be his, as author of it. An in like sort, what is said to be doctrine of an Archheretik, is meant to be his, as author of it. Secondly, because S. Paul did sufficiently condemn certaine doctrines, in calling them the doctrines of Diuels, as supposing, that what is doctrine of Diuels, is of them as authors thereof. Thirdly, because albeit the Diuel hath confessed diuers points of Christian doctrine, yet neuer anie Father, or Christian writer, called anie point thereof, which the Diuel had confessed, the doctrine of the Diuel. Fourthly, because a doctrine, which was ynknown to the Christian world, and

1.

2.

3.

4.

contrarie to the fundamental doctrine of all Christians, from the highest to the lowest, or to that, in which they put the prime and papp of their salvation, and which is urged by manie arguments, and perswaded with all art and strength of the Devil, is the doctrine of the Devil as author of it: But such was the Devils doctrine to Luther, That Masse was Idolatrie. Therefore it was the Devils doctrine as the author of it. The Major is evident: because all the Church of Christ cannot fall into a fundamental error, and such as is contrarie to the prime and papp of their salvation, or become Idolatrous, as generally all Protestants confesse. For a fundamental error destroyeth the Church. The Minor is the foresaid Confessions of Luther, Calvin, and other learned Protestants. Nether is it by accident (as the Lutherans think) that such doctrine as this, is taught by the Devil. For no other can be the prime teacher or suggester of such doctrine, as is contrarie to that, in which all Christians, from the highest

See l. i. of
the Author
of the Prot.
Church c. i.
n. 5.

what is con-
trarie to the
fundamental
doctrine of
all Chris-
tians, is per-
fect the Devils
doctrine.

to the lowest, do put the prore and
pupp their saluation, or which con-
demneth that of idolatrie, in which al
Christians from the highest to the
lowest, put the prore and pupp of their
saluation. I grant, that no fals or lying
teacher can change the truth of the
doctrin, and that the Diuel can confes
Christs doctrin, and that it is Christs
truth, euen in the Diuels mouth: But
I denie, that that can be Gods truth,
which the Diuel teacheth, and earnest-
ly perswadeth, contrarie to that, in
which al Christians, from the highest
to the lowest, put the prore and pupp
of their saluation. What mad man wil
not sooner beleue, that to be Gods
truth, which Gods Church from the
highest to the lowest (which God saith
is the pillar and strengeth of truth)
holds to be the prore and pupp of sal-
uation, then the contrarie, which the
Diuel alone teacheth? I proue not,
(that Masse to be idolatrie) is the
Diuels doctrin, merely becaus the
Diuel taught it: but becaus the Diuel
taught it, it being contrarie to the

prore and pupp of saluation of al Christians. For what doct̃rin is taught of the Diuel, contrarie to that, which al Christians hold to be the prore and pupp of their saluation, is properly the Diuels doct̃rin: both becaus it is peculiar to him and to no other, and also, becaus it condemneth the foundation of saluation of al Christians, of Idolatrie. Wherefore thus againe I argue in forme: What doct̃rin is proper or peculiar to the Diuel, and common to no other Christian preacher, and condemneth that of Idolatrie, which al Christians from the highest to the lowest, beleue to be the foundation of their saluation, that is Diabolical doct̃rin, and cometh from the Diuel as author therof: such was the Diuels doct̃rin to Luther, that Masse was Idolatrie. Therefore, &c.

*No Priest,
no true
Masse.*

3. Nether against this proceed two instances, which Morton produceth. The first is of the Diuel, exhorting a Monke to saie Masse: the second, of the Diuel giuing monie to a man to buy a bel to ring to Masse. For that

Monke, was no Priest, and so could saie no true Masse. And therefore Morton hath since confessed, that he wrongly alleadged this example. His second is also dislike. First, becaus it is not of the diuel teaching anie thing, but cōmanding something. Secondly, and principally, becaus it is not an example of the diuel commaunding anie thing contrarie to the fundamental beleif of the vniuersal Church, as this is: but only of the diuel apointing or commaunding a lawful thing, and allowed by the Church. And we denie not, but the Diuel maie apoint good things for some naughtie end. But he shal neuer bring an example of the Diuel, commaunding or teaching a good thing, which is contrarie to the fundamental beleif of the vniuersal Church: or warning al the Church of auoiding true idolatrie. For what is that which he desireth more, then Idolatrie?

*Howv Protestants seek to auoid, that
the principal point of their doctrin
against Masse, is the Diuels
and diuelish doctrin.*

CHAPTER XVII.

1. **P**rotestants seek manie waies,
how to auoid, that their prin-
cipal doctrin against Masse, is the
Diuels and diuelish doctrin, becaus
no one can make anie shew of satisfac-
tion. But becaus it were too tedious,
to refute them al: I wil refel, what
Chillingworth hath lately deuised,
and others hertofore haue said the les
improbably. He in his Preface n. 43.
*answereth: that Luthers Conference with
the Diuel, might be (for ought, I know)
nothing, but a melancholie dreame: or if
it were real, the Diuel might perswade
him from Masse, hoping by doing so, to
keep him constant to it, or that others*

is not Diabolical, refuted. C. 16. 181
would make his diswaſion from it, an argument for it, and be afraid of following Luther, as confeſſing himſelf to haue been perſwaded by the Diuel. This answer ſheweth plainly, a man vncertaine what to ſaie, whether it were a dreame only, or a real Conference: or what was indeed the Diuels intention in this Conference, and therefore he telleth vs, what might be, but not, what was. And we ask not, what might be, but what was. As for *Might be*, I ſaie of it, as S. Auguſt. ſaith of *Forté*: Where *Might be*, hath place, *Might not be*, maie haue place. Secondly, ether
Chillingworth neuer read Luthers relation of the Conference, or did in his conſcience know, that it was a real conference, and not a dreame of a conference. For Luther ſaith it was when he awaked out of ſleep, and telleth, that the Diuel vſed a great and ſtrong voice, and that his heart did beat, and he ſweat for feare. And Luther oftentimes calleth it a *diſpute*, and neuer a dreame. And Lutherans (as Baldwin in his Apologie c. 4. and in

Chillingw.
telleth vs
what might
be, when he
ſhould tel vs
what was.

1.

2.

It was a
real confe-
rence with
Luther,
being
awake.

182 C.17. *Prot. evas. that their doctrin*
Hyperaspiste, and Rostochiensis Rhe-
tor in his oration of this matter, con-
fes, that it was a real Conference, and
add, that *al ingenuious men wil confes it.*
Besids Chillingworth bringeth no rea-
son or Iauthoritie to proue, that it
was a mere dreame, but merely of
his own authoritie, saith, it might
be so.

*Al ingenu-
ous men
confess it
was a real
conference.*

2. His other surmise, that the Diuel
might diswade Luther from the Masse,
ether for to tie him, or others therby,
faster to it, is first a mere surmise, with-
out anie proof, and therefore a wil-
ful, not rational answer. Besids, we
enquire not, what might be the diuels
intention, but what was his intention.
Nether can it be surmised, that this
might be the diuels intention, but
supposing, that Masse is naught,
which is to suppose the main question
between Catholiks, and Protestants.
Secondly, It is not only void of rea-
son, but contrarie to reason, to imagin,
that it could be the Diuels intent, by
his dipute to tie Luther or others the
faster to the Masse. For who, seing

the multitude of reasons, and perswasions, which the Diuel vseth and his earnestnes to perswade Luther, that Masse is idolatrie, can imagin, that his intention was to make him more constant to Masse? Do Protestants, when they vse al the reasons and perswasions they can, to Catholiks, that Masse is idolatrie, intend to make them more constant to Masse? The Diuel, though he be a Liar, is no fool. And none but fooles, bring al the reasons and perswasions they can, against a thing, and intend therby, to make men more constant to it. But to omit, what ether the Diuel, or men maie do, and to speake, what they vse to do (as here we should) do ether diuels or rational men vse to bring the best reasons and perswasions they can from a thing, and intend by so doing, to perswade to it? And shal we think, that the diuel here did contrarie to that, which both Diuels and rational men vse to do, merely becaus M^r Chillingworth saith, *It might be so?* Is it a good consequence *a posse ad esse*, contrarie to al vsual and

To argue strongly against a thing, is no vsual meanes to perswade to it.

134 C.17. *Prot. euas. that their doctrin*
rational proceedings, both of diuels
and men? shal I saie, that Chilling-
worth, by writing against the Roman
Religion, intēded to make men more
constant to it, becaus it might be so.

3. And hence is refuted, what he
saith, that the Diuel might diswade
Luther from the Masse, hoping ther-
by to tie him or other Papists faster to
it. For we care not, what might be, but
what was the Diuels intention, in dis-
wading Luther from Masse. And there
is no reason, that he should diswade
Luther so violently from Masse, for
to tie ether him or others the more
strongly to Masse, but to bring, both
him, and others from Masse. And al-
beit he knew, that constant Catholiks
would more adhere to Masse, by his
diswading from it: yet he hoped, and
had cause to hope, that if he could
bring Luther from Masse by his rea-
sons and perswasions, he should by Lu-
thers meanes win manie vnstable Ca-
tholiks from Masse. And so, though
in some Catholiks he should not get
his end, yet in manie he should.

Which was a sufficient motiue to him, for to draw Luther from Masse and (by his example and authoritie) manie vnstable Catholiks, as he did. Besids, if the Diuel had meant to tie others to Masse, by that he was author of this diswasiō and disputatiō against Masse, he would haue made this Conference more publikely, and before others, that so it might haue been more notorious, and more sure, that he was the author of this dispute, and of thes arguments against the Masse, or at the least he would haue commaunded Luther to publish this his disputation against the Masse. But in making this his Conference with Luther alone, and in secrete, and at midnight, nor commaunding him to publish that it was the Diuel, that disputed with him against Masse, he clearly shewed, that he did not desire, that it should be known, that he was the Author of this dispute, and of thes arguments against Masse. And consequently, it is euident, that he meant not to tie others faster to Masse, by his im-

The Diuel would haue made this dispute publik if he had meant thereby to tie men to Masse.

186 C. 17. *Pro. euas. that their doctrin*
pugning it, since he shewed no wil, that
it should be known to others, that he
impugned Masse: Nether did Luther
publish this dispute of the Diuel, as
soone as it was made, but some yeares
after, as appeareth by thos his words:
Quondam. In times past. But not the
Diuel, but God would, that at last he
should publish it, that Christians
might beware of him, and be sure, that
in preaching against Masse, he prea-
ched the doctrin of the Diuel. Where-
fore thus I argue: If the Diuel had in-
tended by his dispute against Masse,
to tie men the faster to Masse, he would
ether haue publikely disputed against
Masse, or commaunded Luther to pu-
blish his disputation against it: But he
did nether. Therefore he had no inten-
tion to tie men the faster to Masse, by
his disputing against it. The Maior is
euidēt. For how could he intend to
tie men to Masse, by a secret dispute
against it, and that kept secret from
men? The Minor need no proof, be-
caus it is Negative. And voluntarie
acts are not to be imagined, vnles

is not diabolical, refuted. C. 17. 187
there be proof, wherof here is none,
ether that the Diuel did publikely dis-
pute against Mafse or commaund Lu-
ther to publish his dispute.

4. Others answer, that this dispute
of the Diuel, was to tempt him to
despaire, hauing so manie yeares com-
mitted idolatrie by his saying Mafse.
But first, this is merely volūtarily said.
For in al Luthers relatiō of the Diuels
dispute, there is not one word of the
dispute tempting Luther to despaire.
And yet, Luther, after he had related
the dispute saith: *This was in a manner
the summ of the dispute.* And it had not
been the summ, if the Dispute had
been cheifly a tentation to despaire,
wherof Luther had related no oue
word. Besids, Luther neuer calleth
this a tentation, but stil a disputation.
Moreouer, the Diuel in this dispute
expresly exhorteth Luther to hope or
presumption. For he saith: *Christ in-
stituted, that this Sacrament should be
distributed to the Church, and the Cōmu-
nicants, for to raise up and strēgthen their
faith in what agonie soeuer of various*

*The Diuel
in this dis-
pute tempted
not Luther
to despaire.*

Nor hinde-
reth that
the doctrine
against
Masse is the
Diuels doc-
trin.

188 C.17. *Prot. euas. that their doctrine*
tentations, sin, deuil, &c. And is it like,
that he, who in this dispute thus encour-
aged to hope and confidence, in the
same tempted to despaire? But admit,
that the Diuel intended to driue Lu-
ther to despaire: that was by per-
swading him, that Masse, which
he had so often said, was idolatrie.
And so stil, *That Masse is idolatrie*, is the
doctrine of the Diuel, and iudged of the
Diuel, as a fit meanes to bring Luther
to despaire. So that this Answer rather
sheweth, *That Masse is idolatrie*, is the
doctrine of the Diuel, then the contrarye,
becaus it was not only taught of the
Diuel alone, contrarye to the faith of
the vniuersal Church of Christ, but
also was iudged by him a fit meanes to
driue Luther to desperation. Thus we
see, that Protestants haue no probable
shift to denie, that the Principal point
of their doctrine, *That Masse is idolatrie*
or naught, is the doctrine of the Diuel,
and consequently, no probable shift
to denie, that they are such, as S. Paul
1. *Timor. 4.* foretold: That *In the latter daies some*
shal depart from faith, harkning to spirits

is not diabolical, refuted. C.17. 189
of errors, and doctrins of Diuels. And
can anie man in his wits think, but it is
safer to follow that doctrin, which as
learned Protestants confes, al Christi-
ans from the highest to the lowest be-
leued, and in which they put the prore
and pup of their saluation, then that
doctrin, which some Protestants plaine-
ly confes, and none can probably
denie, but it is the doctrin of the Diuel?
And I would haue the Reader to con-
sider wel thes points. First, that it was
a real dispute of the Diuel with Luther,
when he was awake. Secondly, it was
a secret dispute of the Diuel with Lu-
ther only, and at midnight. Thirdly,
the Diuel neuer comaunded or coun-
selled Luther to publish, that he was
author of this dispute against Masse.
Fourthly, it was a most earnest dispute
of the Diuel, wherein he vsed the best
reasons and perswasions he could, to
perswade Luther, that Masse was idola-
trie. Fifthly, that his dispute was against
a thing, in which al Christians at
that time, did set the prore and pup of
their saluation. Sixtly, that if it were

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

390 C. 17. *Prot. enas. that their doctrin*
true idolatrie, from which the Diuel
should so earnestly endeauour to draw
al Christians, he must haue least the
nature of a Diuel, who desireth no-
thing more, thē the dishonor of God,
and damnation of soules by idolatrie.
And who wel considereth al thes
points, wil easily see, that it is the
true doctrin of the Diuel, that Masse
is idolatrie. And if it be the doctrin of
of the Diuel, it is evidently such doc-
trin, as the Apostle foretold, that in
the latter times some should depart from
faith, barkning to spirits of errors and doc-
1. Timot. 4. *trins of Diuels.* And if it be the doctrin
of Diuels that Masse is naught, it is the
doctrin of God, that Masse is good.
And thus much out of learned Protec-
tants confessions, that the Roman
Church is a true Church, and that in
her is sauing faith, saluation, and sa-
fetic: and that the cheifest point of
Protestant Religion, is the doctrin of
the deuil, from which God deliuer al
Christians.

FINIS.

Al praise to almightie God.

